FBIS DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 235 8 December 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Government Statement on U.S. SALT II Violation [PRAVDA 7 Dec] AA 1
Karpov Makes Statement on Geneva Talks Results AA 4
TV Statement AA 5
Views Disarmament Issues AA 5
[Bonn DIE WELT 6 Dec]
Bogachev Examines NATO Defense Ministers' Meeting AA 7

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Volskiy, Kassis, Andrianov] CC 1
Demichev Receives Yugoslav, Japanese Figures [PRAVDA 5 Dec] CC 7

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Receives Aristov; Trade Protocol Signed [IZVESTIYA 7 Dec] A 1
Baldridge: U.S. Wants To Improve Trade Relations A 2
Armand Hammer's Meetings With Officials Noted A 2
Meets With Shevardnadze [IZVESTIYA 8 Dec] A 2
Received by Ryzhkov [PRAVDA 8 Dec] A 3
Daniloff Book Breaks 'Gentlemen's Agreement' [Ponomarev in IZVESTIYA 4 Dec] A 4
Continuing Coverage of U.S.-Iran Arms Deals A 7
Reagan 'Sabotage' Effort A 7
Speakes To Resign A 8
Reagan Admits 'Mistakes' A 9
TASS Notes 15th Test Launch of MX Missile A 10

NORTHEAST ASIA

Ryzhkov Message to Soviet-Japanese Roundtable [PRAVDA 1 Dec] C 1
Voss, Kovalenko Meet JSP Chairwoman 5 Dec C 2
Potential for Japanese Economic Exchanges Viewed [Alekseyev] C 2
Japan Rebuked for Backing U.S. SALT II Breach [Dmitriyev] C 3
Lizichev Meets With DPRK's Kim Il-song [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec] C 4
DPRK Reportage [cross-reference] C 5

DPRK Official Rejects Dam Project 'Slander' C 5
Kim Il-song, Mongolia's Batmonh Speak at Rally C 6
[PRAVDA 22 Nov]
Protocol on 1987 Trade Signed With Mongolia C 6
[IZVESTIYA 5 Dec]

SOUTH ASIA

Military Cantonment Turned Over to DRA D 1
Demichev Meets With DRA Prosecutor General D 1
[PRAVDA 5 Dec]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Lao Leaders Interviewed on Congress Results E 1
[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]
Sokolov Greets Laos' Khamtai on Anniversary E 4
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Dec]

EASTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Chebrikov Visit to SFRY F 1
Meets Provincial Chairman F 1
Departs Ljubljana For Home F 1
Sokolov Greets SFRY's Mamula on National Day F 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Nov]

WESTERN EUROPE

Norwegian Prime Minister Meets With Leaders G 1
Arrives 4 Dec G 1
Meets With Gorbachev [PRAVDA 7 Dec] G 1
Talks With Ryzhkov [PRAVDA 7 Dec] G 3
Soviet-Norwegian Fisheries Commission Meets G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

IZVESTIYA Views Speech by Iran's Velayati H 1
[Seregin 7 Dec]
Trade Protocol Signed With Egypt H 1
PRAVDA Scores Western 'Conspiracy' Against Syria H 2
[7 Dec]
Ministers Express Solidarity With Palestinians H 4
United Arab Emirates' Leader Greeted on Election H 4
Briefs: Mauritanian Ambassador Credentials H 4

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Gorbachev Addresses Theater Workers R 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec]
Investigators of Moldavian Abuses Obstructed R 3
[Kondratov in IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]

Moldavian Consumer Services Minister Dismissed R 7
[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIA 28 Nov]
Yeltsin Speaks at Restructuring Progress Seminar R 8
[Muladzhanov in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Nov]
Yeltsin Addresses Moscow Officials on Harvest R 8
[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Nov]
PRAVDA Views CPSU Resolution on Law Enforcement [30 Nov] R 8
Entombment of Chernobyl Reactor Completed R 12

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Motives for Economic 'Restructuring' Assessed S 1
[Korenev in Bratislava PRAVDA 14 Nov]

GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON U.S. SALT II VIOLATION

PM081001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 86 First Edition p 1

["Soviet Government Statement" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The other day, the United States additionally put into service the 131st heavy bomber equipped to carry long-range cruise missiles without dismantling any equivalent nuclear-weapon delivery vehicle in compensation.

By making this step, it overstepped the aggregate limit, fixed by the SALT II treaty, of 1,320 units on the number of MIRVed strategic ballistic missile launchers and cruise missile-armed heavy bombers.

The U.S. does not conceal that this amounts to its total abandonment of the SALT II treaty which, as the U.S. Administration put it, was left behind it. Therefore, practical actions followed President Reagan's statement made last May about the intention to reject the 1972 interim agreement and the 1979 SALT II treaty, the statement that drew anxiety and condemnation around the world.

A treaty which has sealed military parity between the USSR and the United States and limited the nuclear arms race for a whole number of years in its central area -- the field of strategic offensive arms -- has now been trampled underfoot. The value and usefulness of this agreement consisted in its provisions on the sides' commitments to observe both quantitative and qualitative restrictions on their strategic nuclear means. The SALT II treaty provided for substantially narrowing possibilities to modernize these systems. Besides, it set corresponding limits on the main groups of strategic systems. Compliance with all these provisions, based on the sides' recognition of the principle of equality and equal security, ensured strategic stability and served as a point of departure in the search for ways of limiting and eliminating nuclear weapons.

The decision to beef up the U.S. arsenal of strategic means and violate the SALT II treaty has been dictated by nothing other than a desire by Washington to upset the military parity between the USSR and the United States and assure itself of military superiority. These actions are fraught with serious consequences for international security.

By undertaking them, the United States opens the gate to an unlimited race in strategic nuclear arms, which will inevitably sharpen the dangerous rivalry in the military field. The refusal to abide by the agreed restrictions on the quantitative growth and qualitative modernization of strategic offensive arms can make the situation unpredictable.

The United States has dealt the final blow to the SALT II treaty now but it has been undercutting it for more than one year. In the very first days after taking over the White House the Reagan administration gave up for lost the treaty's ratification. At the same time it launched activities that were in clear violation of the SALT II treaty. Ignoring the special restrictions set by the protocol to the treaty, for example, the United States has started mass deployments of long-range cruise missiles. Washington has obviously circumvented the treaty also by stationing its medium-range missiles in Western Europe as a supplement to the U.S. strategic potential.

Work has forged ahead at full tilt, in the meantime; to carry out an unprecedented program for modernizing and building up strategic offensive arms in all areas, with new MX and Midgetman intercontinental ballistic missiles, B-1B and stealth strategic bombers and nuclear-powered submarines with Trident-1 and Trident-2 missiles being developed and built.

Washington's attitude to the issue of stopping nuclear weapons testing has been a vivid manifestation of the militarist fever gripping it. The United States has not only refused to follow the example of the Soviet Union and declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions but has also been reluctant to discuss the issue and declined to go into talks whose aim would be a complete and ultimate end to nuclear testing.

The SALT II treaty was, of course, a serious impediment to all these militarist programs. This is why in Washington they decided to do away with it once and for all.

The military-industrial bosses' interests, connected with the development of a large-scale anti-missile defense system with space-based elements and of space strike weapons, enter into conflict with the ABM treaty in just the same manner.

By means of the 'Star Wars' program the United States wants to extend the spiral of the arms race over to outer space and to convert outer space into a military citadel and staging area for the establishment of U.S. hegemony. This is why, to the U.S. Administration, the ABM treaty is next target after the SALT II treaty. The U.S. Administration has set about gradually shaking this agreement loose as well.

Washington cannot but be aware that such a policy gives rise to mounting indignation in the world. Hence, the endeavors to cover it up with talk about 'mutual restraint', and with declarative statements about commitment to nuclear disarmament, the statements which are being accompanied with every kind of inventions as to alleged violations of the obligations by the Soviet side.

The United States' break out of the SALT II treaty does not leave a trace of that scrim of verbiage and fully lays bare the militarist essence of the U.S. policy for the whole world to see.

As for U.S. propaganda efforts to misinform the world public by ascribing to the Soviet Union some violations of the strategic arms agreements, those are a desperate and dishonest attempt by diverting attention from the United States as the true destroyer of strategic stability and at finding if only some justifications for its departure from the international treaties.

The Soviet Union has been always strictly and honestly abiding by all the articles and all the provisions of the SALT II treaty, just as those of other international agreements as well.

It is significant that the United States decided to deal a blow to the structure of fundamental accords in the field of strategic arms limitation precisely at a time when a prospect for an improvement of the international situation had appeared, at last.

The Soviet program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 has found wide-spread understanding and favorable response throughout the world. The initiatives which were put forward on the basis of the program and with which our country went to the meeting in Reykjavik opened up real ways towards a nuclear-free world.

The idea of a comprehensive system of international security is striking deep root. The new thinking in international affairs which has found reflection, in particular, in the Delhi declaration signed by the leaders of the USSR and India recently, is more and more tangibly supplanting the dogmas of power politics. Possibilities for a fundamental change in the entire international situation have begun to show.

The choice of precisely this moment by the U.S. Administration to torpedo the SALT II treaty cannot be regarded otherwise than a major provocation and an attempt at stopping the tendency towards relaxation of international tension.

The U.S. step is a logical element of the campaign of attacks against the historic opportunities which the Reykjavik meeting offered and which would open up the road to a nuclear-free world which, as it turned out, is being dreaded by the U.S. militarist circles so much.

Washington is making a big mistake. The exceeding of the limits set by the SALT II treaty will not strengthen U.S. security.

The results of the 6 years of the present administration's stay in office confirm: In the field of arms limitation the administration, without constructing anything, has destroyed and is destroying much.

Naturally, the U.S. decision, as the Soviet Government warned in its statement of May 31, 1986, gives the Soviet Union all grounds to regard itself free from its commitment under the 1972 interim agreement and the SALT II treaty.

At the same time, the Soviet side believes that there is still an opportunity for stopping the dangerous course of events that is being provoked by the irresponsible actions of the present U.S. Administration.

In America and outside it, it may be presumed, there is still enough political wisdom and the mere sense of self-preservation not to allow the wrecking of the entire structure of accords on the limitation of strategic arms that was created during 15 years.

Taking into account the immense universal importance of the issue and the need to preserve the key constraint on the strategic arms race, the USSR refrains for the time being from breaking out of the limitation under SALT I and SALT II.

All who cherish the cause of peace should realize that the task of uniting the forces in favor of the persistent search for a way out of the dangerous impasse into which the U.S. militarist circles are pushing mankind is urgent and acute today as never before. A reliable obstacle should be placed in the way of the imperial ambitions of domination on earth and in outer space.

The Soviet Union, for its part, resolutely counterposes a course of peace and international security to the irresponsible policy of the current U.S. Administration.

KARPOV MAKES STATEMENT ON GENEVA TALKS RESULTS

LD05184 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 86 First Edition p 5

["At the Geneva Talks" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] A 4-day working meeting of representatives of the Soviet and U.S. delegations within the framework of talks on nuclear and space arms came to a close here.

Head of the Soviet delegation Viktor Karpov made the following statement on its results:

The Soviet side placed at the center of the discussions at the meeting the new comprehensive proposals of the USSR that were submitted at the talks on November 7 of this year on the results of the meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik.

The key importance of solving the question of strengthening the regime of the ABM treaty for attaining accords on radical reductions of nuclear arms right up to and including their total elimination was pointed out and a well-argued criticism of Washington's policy of department from the understandings reached in the Icelandic capital was made.

The attention of the U.S. side was drawn to the extremely negative consequences that the Administration's decision to put into service the 131st B-52 strategic bomber equipped with long-range cruise missiles will have. This measure, signifying that the United States has transcended the limits imposed by the SALT II treaty, contradicts the logic of Reykjavik and creates additional obstacles at the talks.

The consultations showed that no changes had occurred in the U.S. side's approach -- it is still blocking the essential [predmetnaya] work directed at achieving mutually acceptable agreements.

The U.S. side remains opposed to any restrictions on the implementation of the SDI program which, as is known, is the chief obstacle in the way of nuclear disarmament.

It actually evaded discussing the Soviet proposals of November 7, 1986, and did nothing to overcome the differences that remain between the sides.

[Moscow TASS in English at 1811 GMT on 5 December 1986 carries an otherwise identical version of the Karpov statement which here adds the following two paragraphs:

"Instead, the American representatives reproduced their previous unilateral positions, that have nothing in common with Reykjavik, the implementation of which would instigate the arms race in all directions, including its transfer into outer space.

"The meeting was in fact additional confirmation of the fact that the U.S. is continuing the course towards departing from the platform agreed upon in the Icelandic capital, towards renouncing the mutual understanding outlined there with regard to the need for a comprehensive solution to the problem of nuclear and space arms."]

From the Soviet side, the U.S. approach was assessed as an attempt to revert the talks to the situation when they were actually in an impasse -- due to the U.S. stand as well.

The representatives of the Soviet delegation pointed at the inadmissibility of the course and called on the American side to adjust its position and undertake reciprocal steps so that practical work could be started at the next round of talks in January next year on translating the positive results of Reykjavik into binding agreements.

TV Statement

LD071923 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A working meeting between the representatives of the Soviet and U.S. delegations within the framework of the talks on nuclear and space arms has ended in Geneva. Our correspondent met with Comrade Karpov, leader of the USSR delegation.

[Begin Karpov recording] An obvious tendency has begun to take shape, on the part of the U.S. side, to get away from Reykjavik, to get away from the positive results which have presented the nuclear disarmament problem in a new light and which have ensured the possibility of moving fast along the path of deep reductions of nuclear arms, right up to and including elimination of the offensive strategic arms of the USSR and the United States.

It has again been confirmed that the main obstacle in the way of an accord of this kind is the U.S. side's unwillingness to limit, in any way, its so-called SDI program during the period of reductions and elimination of the strategic offensive arms. Therein lies the crux of the issue. Apart from this, the United States, departing from the Reykjavik spirit, currently does not wish to engage in serious talking on complete elimination of strategic offensive arms, and wishes to reduce the question to a narrower agreement concerning the elimination of ballistic missiles and, even better -- as transpires from the deliberations that have taken place -- generally just to talk a bit about the 50 percent reductions of strategic offensive arms, without defining in advance the future possibilities for deeper reductions. [end recording]

Views Disarmament Issues

DW071927 Bonn DIE WELT in German 6 Dec 86 p 5

[Article by Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva Arms control negotiations: "They Say Something and Mean Something Different"]

[Text] The Reykjavik results have aroused many political forces in Europe and have touched off divergent and frequently conflicting reactions.

Strangely enough, certain politicians from various European countries were so frightened at the prospect of nuclear disarmament in Europe that they protested energetically. [paragraph continues]

How else can the FRG leadership's attitude be assessed which took great pains to persuade Washington not to disarm, and even tried to convince the United States that a 50-percent reduction in offensive strategic weapons would critically jeopardize the future of NATO strategy and would threaten to undermine the security of NATO countries.

Following the visit to Washington by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and obviously under her influence a communique was published in which a statement on the talk to liquidate offensive strategic weapons was deleted from the Reykjavik complex, leaving only a statement on their reduction.

There were also strange changes of mind regarding the problem of intermediate-range missiles in Europe. Whereas previously leading European politicians stressed that they were supporting a "zero option," in other words, they agreed to the removal of all U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles in Europe, they have now made a complete about-turn. The prospect held out in Reykjavik of the liquidation of intermediate-range missiles evidently has alarmed them so much that they are inventing ever new obstacles allegedly preventing such decision. It is no coincidence that problems have been pushed to the fore that are not directly related to intermediate-range missiles.

Let us consider how serious the arguments advanced against such a solution are.

First, the Soviet nuclear disarmament program envisages the removal of all tactical nuclear weapons, the problem can be resolved, and the Soviet Union suggests a solution.

Second, the Warsaw Pact countries' Budapest proposals to which NATO still owes a response, also provide for the removal of operational-tactical systems as part of the reduction of conventional armaments.

Third, the Soviet Union has repeatedly stated, that immediately following the removal of U.S. intermediate-range missiles it would withdraw its operational-tactical weapons from the territory of the GDR and CSSR, which were deployed as a countermeasure to the deployment of U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe.

On the other hand, it should be recalled that Britain's and France's very substantial nuclear weapons arsenals as well as U.S. nuclear systems in advanced positions will stay in Europe. They will still be there for an indefinite and possibly not even short time following the removal of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe. So there is no reason to assert that the removal of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range missiles will make NATO defenseless.

The Soviet Union also is ready to negotiate on drastic conventional arms reductions in all of Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. There are no conditions on our part, whereas NATO on various pretext avoids discussing the problem. In order to justify the sabotage of nuclear disarmament in Europe, NATO even tries to tell lies about the Warsaw Pact's alleged conventional superiority.

There are other attempts as well to discredit Reykjavik. The Soviet Union allegedly has demanded "all or nothing," because it knew in advance that the United States would make no concessions on SDI. That is absolutely not correct. The Soviet Union does not ask the United States for more than has been officially stated by the U.S. side on the highest level. [paragraph continues]

The United States' official standpoint is this: SDI is merely a research program. The Soviet Union suggest that the United States should confine itself to laboratory research and carry out no test in space for 10 years. If the statement of the U.S. President and other officials are realistic, there should be no obstacle to the acceptance of the Soviet proposal. But obviously American statemen say something and mean something entirely different. They want to have the opportunity of fully implementing the SDI program in the course of the decade in which the plan on the removal of offensive strategic weapons could be implemented.

The Europeans have no reason to be afraid of Reykjavik. Reykjavik is an initial step to a world without nuclear weapons. It allows a drastic improvement of European security and in the final analysis would preclude the outbreak of a nuclear or conventional war on the European continent.

BOGACHEV EXAMINES NATO DEFENSE MINISTERS MEETING

LD051556 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS -- By TASS Military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

The United States is taking further measures to fasten West European countries to its "Star Wars" program and make them accomplices in violations of the 1972 Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems. Speaking in Brussels following a meeting of the NATO countries' defense ministers, Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger announced that orders had been placed with a number of industrial companies to develop a missile defense system for Western Europe. The U.S. defense secretary said that all NATO countries should work together to provide such a defense for Western Europe. The Soviet-U.S. ABM treaty, in the meantime, prohibits the parties, in no uncertain terms, either to transfer ABM systems or components to other countries or to deploy them outside their national territories. No "broad" or "narrow" interpretations of the treaty, which have gained currency in Washington, can cast even a hint of doubt on the meaning of its Article 9. Weinberger did not dare do this either, although he doesn't usually stand upon ceremony with treaties and is in the habit of casuistically interpreting U.S. commitments in the field of arms limitation and reduction.

Commenting on the Pentagon chief's announcement in Brussels Western analysts pointed out the fact that the combined worth of the American orders connected with a missile defense for Western Europe is 12 million dollars, or 300 times less than the sum set aside this fiscal year to develop an ABM defense for the United States itself.

It is crystal-clear that Washington's latest move is purely political and aims not to protect U.S. allies from a mythical "threat of a missile attack" but make certain that West European countries will support the U.S. "Star Wars" program. U.S. obstructionist actions in the field of arms limitation and reduction, including the renunciation of the SALT-2 treaty, the continued deployment of American first-strike medium-range missiles in Western Europe, the crash effort to develop strategic offensive arms and the refusal to honor the promise made in Geneva to prevent an arms race in space, make it clear that the Pentagon continues to abide by an aggressive strategy. Its purport is best expressed by this formula: "An antimissile shield for the United States, a limited nuclear war for Europe".

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD072007 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 7 Dec 86

["International Observers at the Roundtable" program with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board of ZA RUBEZHOM; and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, chief editor for GOLOS RODINY newspaper and OTCHIZNA magazine, presented by Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentator]

[Text] [Andrianov] Judging from the world public's reaction, a special place in this year's chronicle will be taken up by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to India. It is no accident that is being called historic. It has been marked by a document of a truly global scale, that is, the Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. It reflects accurately and clearly the new political thinking which responds to the conditions of the nuclear and space age. The ideas and principles formulated in this document express the interests of the whole world community and the hopes and aspirations of all peoples. These ideas and principles are turned toward a peaceful future for mankind, which is why they are of permanent significance. The principles contained in the Delhi declaration have been tested by life itself; it is precisely this circumstance, the energetic actions by the Soviet Union and India on the international arena in the name of peace and for preventing a nuclear war, and the increased role of our states in world affairs that have given their leaders the moral right to address such an appeal.

[Volskiy] Already the days are passing by since the end of Comrade Gorbachev's visit to India, but the attention of the press, television, and radio of various countries to this important event is not lessening; on the contrary, it is growing. This is perhaps because there are events taking place in Asia and the world as a whole which are confirming the correctness of the assessments made during Comrade Gorbachev's Delhi visit. In regard to the Western press -- and the U.S. press, of course -- there one feels a certain absentmindedness, as though they are surprised as to why now, precisely at this moment, Soviet-Indian friendly relations have been given such a serious new impetus. What is the reason for this? Various versions are put forward with reference, for example, to the fact that allegedly, at the moment India is most apprehensive of Pakistan's militarization.

Pakistan's militarization is, of course, a dangerous thing for India and for Asia as a whole. But of course, it is not only here and not so much here that the main reason for the further rapprochement between India and the Soviet Union lies. They talk about the fact that the Soviet Union at the moment has some sort of special interest in looking for states that might cooperate with it in Asia, and this is correct. But this does not mean that it cooperates with just one state and cooperates less with others. On the contrary, we have a wide range of partnerships in Asia, and Soviet-Indian relations are indeed a model of such mutual relations between states with different social systems, which are of an organic nature. Therein lies the value for all mankind -- even for the whole world, I would say -- of Soviet-Indian relations.

[Andrianov] Well, this value of Soviet-Indian relations for all mankind has been embodied, first of all, in the Delhi declaration and the principles of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. There is no country, I think, for which this document does not have the utmost significance. Is that not so?

[Volskiy] This is first and foremost because new political thinking has been embodied in this declaration, which is so essential in our nuclear age, and it contains a profound, I would say, a worldwide or even a philosophical meaning. Indeed, take our societies: Soviet society and Indian society are different. They are by no means the same, neither in their social system nor in their ideological sources, but in their urge to protect civilization from destruction, they have united on a common platform expressed by the historic clauses of the Delhi declaration. This is very important, of course, not only for the Soviet Union and India, for the point here is whom they represent: The socialist countries on the one hand and the developing, nonaligned states on the other. That is already the overwhelming majority of mankind.

[Kassis] But, Dmitriy Antonovich, the Soviet-Indian talks have exerted a particular influence, obviously, on the situation in Asia, where our two countries are neighbors.

[Volskiy] Absolutely, Vadim Borisovich, although it is not such a simple issue. You know that the Soviet Union has lately devoted ever-growing attention to consolidating Asian security, and not only security and peace on the Asian continent itself as such, but also in the huge waters adjacent to it, on the Indian and Pacific Oceans. You remember the large-scale program for normalizing the situation in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region put forward by Comrade Gorbachev at the end of July, when he spoke in Vladivostok. We proceed from the fact that the significance of that region for world economics and politics is growing. That is why the all-embracing system of international security cited at the 27th party congress is a system which must extend without fail in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region. Without it, without stable peace there, there cannot be any stable peace in general.

[Andrianov] I think it would be relevant to recall how our country visualizes in practice the inclusion of the Asian and Pacific Ocean region into a system of international security, that is: regional settlements; a stop to the proliferation and buildup of nuclear weapons; a reduction in naval activity; the resumption of talks on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace; a reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments; the elaboration of measures on confidence-building and the nonuse of force.

[Volskiy] Here one could and one should add our idea on holding a conference on the Asian and Pacific Ocean region along the lines of the Helsinki Conference in Europe. Of course we are not naive people; we do not think that all these initiatives can be implemented overnight. What is needed here is a very great deal of lengthy and difficult work, I think, work by all who are interested in this.

It is no accident that at the Delhi summit talks, in the discussion of the issues connected with the improving the situation in Asia, there was particular emphasis on the importance of a stage-by-stage approach to this matter, to normalizing the situation and strengthening peace in Asia with a stage-by-stage approach which, one can recall, the Soviet Union has been proposing for some time now. After all, it is no secret that in certain circles, in India as well, there has been prejudice toward the Soviet initiative in Asia. It has sometimes been misinterpreted that allegedly only our country is interested in these Soviet undertakings. If one is to judge from press reports at any rate, it was at the Delhi talks that this process -- which had already been outlined previously -- found a continuation; this process of overcoming misgivings, overcoming alienation regarding Asian security issues, overcoming unsuccessful experience in this sphere, and past experience.

It is no surprise that at the moment, the U.S. press -- and not only the U.S. press -- is trying to belittle the significance of the visit. It is, so to speak, stirring up various points which could intensify the confrontational situation in Asia, which could bring about ideas there to the effect that confrontation and tension are something that is somehow unavoidable on this huge continent and in the adjacent regions. In this connection, one could recall that there is indeed a very great deal of local, or as one says now, regional conflict, precisely in Asia, in its various areas. But the United States and its propaganda speculates on this and is trying to paint the picture that inasmuch as these conflicts exist, it is difficult to consolidate the process of Asian security. This argument does not stand up to criticism. Would it not be easier to achieve a settlement precisely on the difficult regional problems if one could achieve an improvement in the overall political climate in Asia, which would also affect local situations? But Washington is in fact acting in the opposite direction, and I would even say, in two directions at once. On the one hand it is striving to block the general process of positive change in Asia and on the other hand it is fomenting regional conflicts there, and indeed, we have the scandal of U.S. arms supplies to Iran.

[Andrianov] Yes, Dmitriy Antonovich, you are quite right to move on to precisely that Iranian scandal. It is now in its fifth week. It is still raging in Washington. What is more, all attempts by the Reagan administration to put a stop to it have only fueled the flames of bitterly critical remarks in the United States itself. The flames of the scandal, it must be said, have brought to light more and more unsavory facts that indicate the hypocrisy, cynicism, deceit, and duplicity of those who started this whole nasty business and who are now trying very clumsily to get themselves out of it.

[Kassis] I would like to quote a passage from THE NEW YORK TIMES. It has literally the following to say: The story of the supply of arms to Iran and the Nicaraguan contras has given rise to the most serious crisis in the whole of Reagan's 6 years in office. The White House staff find themselves in a terribly difficult position. Shocked Americans want to be given serious and trustworthy explanations of what has happened. Instead, administration representatives behave like frightened bureaucrats with something to hide. To what the U.S. paper has said, it must be added that, over and above all that, Washington has been sending weapons via Iran to the gangs of Afghan dushmans as well. In the view of some Western press organs, there were other recipients of U.S. weapons deliveries.

[Andrianov] The public disclosures have given a real fright to the White House, spreading alarm and confusion among its occupants. All that has been clearly demonstrated in the contradictory and flimsy justifications dictated by the wish to conceal the truth. Here is just one example: The Athens newspaper DHIMOKRATIKOS LOGOS found out that the United States had supplied Iran with weapons valued at over $1 billion and it featured this story in its pages. Commenting on that report, the U.S. ASSOCIATED PRESS indicated that the value of the arms supplied to Iran was 100 times higher than the amount given by the Washington administration's official spokesmen. What was the reaction in the White House to this revealing information? Its spokesman refused categorically to say anything about the Greek newspaper report. That refusal is, perhaps, more eloquent than any words.

[Kassis] Yes, the White House's Iran operation literally has caused an avalanche of accusations to descend on the Reagan administration, and, as the French QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS considers, the ring of accusations is closing more and more around the head of the Washington administration himself. This view is supported by solid foundations.

There is good reason for people in political circles in Washington and in the U.S. press to state bluntly that the dismissal of the two men who directly handled the Iranian deal was an attempt to shield the President himself, as well as other people in his immediate entourage. In this connection, the U.S. agency UPI, for instance, emphasizes that one of those dismissed, Marine Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North, had long been one of Reagan's trusted aides, and that he kept Donald Regan, the White House chief of staff -- who is referred to as the U.S. President's right-hand man -- constantly informed of developments.

[Andrianov] One must assume that that is the reason why the Washington administration is resorting to all kinds of tricks, hoping to conceal additional information on the secret deals with Iran. The White House leadership led us to believe, for example, that the key figures involved in the scandal would not testify before Congress. Why not? Because, we are told, they enjoy the privilege of executive power. The reference to that circumstance is, of course, intentional; one could even say, deliberate. After all, what is meant in this case by that privilege is the opportunity to conceal information that is to Washington's disadvantage, on the pretext of maintaining confidentiality and ensuring national security.

[Kassis] Well, Boris Vasilyevich, tactics of that sort are, quite frankly, nothing new at all. Suffice it to recall that President Nixon resorted to similar devices as far back as 1974, when the so-called Watergate scandal broke. That scandalous business was connected with a secret operation, sanctioned by the former head of the White House, which contrived to steal documents from the rival party's headquarters. How it all ended is well known. No matter how Nixon tried to evade responsibility, he did not manage to pull it off, and the former President was forced to leave the White House in disgrace.

[Volskiy] Yes, well, the organizers of the current scandalous affair -- called Irangate by analogy with Watergate -- are now at all costs trying to ensure their political survival. That is why they are feverishly endeavoring to cover their tracks, are dodging this way and that, are resorting to various hypocritical devices, and are shifting responsibility onto one another. In this behavior there is, I think, a quite definite sort of logic which emerges from all Washington's actions during the Iranian affair. After all, remember, it was constructed on duplicity and lies from the outset. They have now been used by the organizers of the adventure that has been exposed. They have used them in order to evade responsibility for this scandalous venture of theirs and somehow to justify themselves in the eyes of the international public.

[Andrianov] Time will show how events develop further, of course. It is already perfectly clear now that the White House's Iranian operation has given rise among the U.S. public to serious doubts about the administration's ability to govern the country responsibly. In this connection, I would like to quote a comment -- not the harshest by any means -- from among those that have appeared in the transatlantic press. Let us assume, the paper NEWSDAY says, that Reagan did not know of the secret financial help to the contras. How then does he manage the White House, and what sort of people are working for him? After all, it is not a question of trifles, the paper stresses, but of the violation of U.S. laws by the National Security Council.

[Kassis] Incidentally, a U.S. opinion poll shows that now 8 out of every 10 Americans no longer believe the White House. Thus, there is a crisis of confidence in the institution of executive power among the U.S. public.

[Andrianov] The phenomenon is, I think, perfectly natural. It is not fortuitous, for example, that Senator Gary Hart stated that there is an atmosphere of irresponsibility and lawlessness in the domain of the White House's foreign policy.

The Reagan administration's Iranian affair lends full support to the U.S. congressman's conclusion. The very essence of that adventure, its political content, and its direction fit perfectly into Washington's global foreign policy course. This course relies on force and gross interference in the affairs of sovereign states, a penchant for adventures and, at the same time, attempts to conceal these adventures behind a tissue of lies in concert with their militarist and hegemonist pretensions. All that has been particularly vividly revealed by Washington's Iranian affair, which has shown world opinion the darkest corners of the current U.S. Administration's foreign policy intrigues.

[Volskiy] Boris Vasilyevich, it seems to me that not only the foreign policy intrigues have been revealed, but also the domestic policy intrigues, because this problem with the Irangate scandal has a direct bearing on the human rights question. After all, the U.S. Administration has tried to bypass both the U.S. Constitution and the established procedure for carrying out any foreign policy or, to an even greater extent, financial actions.

[Kassis] Yes, human rights. That phrase has been making the political rounds for many years now. As you rightly say, Dmitriy Antonovich, Washington has a special fondness for it. This was precisely the place that saw the first formulation and launch into orbit of the slanderous tale about the human rights violations supposedly taking place in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It is precisely in Washington that attempts are still being made to interfere directly in the internal affairs of the socialist countries on the pretext of defending dissidents.

[Andrianov] It is a really amazing situation. Just think. Who is assuming the role of judge in the matter of civil rights and liberties? The very society that is itself built on a system of oppression and persecution!

[Volskiy] Take the United States. We have already spoken of Irangate as an example of outrage upon the Americans' own constitutional inventions, so to speak. Disregard of the law, which formally, one might think, protects citizens against lawlessness, is practiced by both the police and the state authorities. Racism has entered right into the flesh and blood of U.S. society; it is not even regarded as any kind of defect, but as a perfectly normal concept.

[Andrianov] From the point of view of the Washington...

[Volskiy, interrupting] From the point of view of the Washington leaders. Persecution of dissidents or total surveillance -- and not only of progressive people and organizations -- total surveillance is carried out on people who are considered to be perfectly loyal to the leadership, to the government, to the U.S. regime.

[Kassis] Incidentally, the various provocative statements about alleged human rights violations in the Soviet Union are more and more frequently boomeranging on those who make them and causing annoyance among the public. At times this displeasure finds expression on the pages of the mass information media as well. I recall, for example, an article in THE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER; I will quote just one paragraph. Though unwillingly, we have to recognize, the newspaper states, that the Soviet leadership is acting correctly when it warns our administration that it is demonstratively interfering in the domestic affairs of other states. The U.S. President should not forget that he was elected by Americans in order to direct the U.S. people; he was not elected by the citizens of other countries to direct affairs which concern them alone.

[Adrianov] A thoroughly fitting reproof, in my view. One might also recall the words of another newspaper, THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, which emphasized that all the United States' attacks concerning human rights in the USSR are tied up with an important trait of the American character -- hypocrisy.

[Kassis] Yes, and one can find a great multitude of scandalous examples of hypocrisy in the White House and indeed in the U.S. Congress as well. The question arises as to how one can display concern over human rights in the socialist countries, while officially receiving with much pomp the Afghan counterrevolutionaries, the dushmans. Or think back to the air pirates, the (Brazinskas), father and son, the very men who hijacked an AN-24 aircraft, killed the stewardess, and injured the pilots. They ended up under the protection of the so-called U.S. civil rights and started to enjoy the U.S. version of freedom.

[Volskiy] Well, there you have it, inverted morality. If we are looking back into history then we should recall the UN Charter, which was adopted way back in 1945; the principle of respect for human rights was established as one of the main foundations of relations between states. It is written in the charter that one of the United Nations' objectives consists of -- and here I will quote this important document -- one of the United Nations' objectives consists of encouraging and developing respect for human rights and for the basic freedoms of all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. Further on, the Charter stresses the necessity of respecting and observing human rights. Thus, the UN member states unanimously agreed that it is necessary to respect and observe these rights, and subsequently these ideas were revealed and given concrete form in a whole range on important international documents.

[Kassis] Well, let us mention some of them, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly 38 years ago, on 10 December 1948. The declaration is of a recommendatory nature. Subsequently, the entire human rights complex was reflected in greater detail in the human rights pacts, international treaties, that is, documents which are legally binding for their participants. Both pacts -- the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights and the International Pact on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights -- were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 16 December 1966 and came into force in 1976. The Soviet Union was the first of the great powers to ratify these important documents.

[Adrianov] Among the international documents concerning human rights there is another one which, in my view, should be mentioned: the CSCE Final Act. It should be emphasized that international cooperation in the human rights sphere is not an isolated area, but part of international and interstate cooperation as a whole. It is inseparable from the other parts of this cooperation and should take place in conditions of cooperation on reinforcing international peace and security. It is this which is not to the liking of those who oppose an improvement in the international climate; it is against this that they carry out constant subversive work in an attempt to raise the issue of alleged human rights violations in the socialist countries.

[Kassis] Our listeners already know that at the beginning of November, a meeting of representatives of CSCE participant states started its work in Vienna. I had occasion to talk with the head of our delegation, Ambassador Yuriy Kashlev, who stressed that among other important issues, the Soviet Union has a clear-cut and constructive position when examining issues relating to culture, education, information, the protection of human rights, basic freedoms, and human contacts. In connection with this, Yuriy Kashlev recalled the spring conference in Bern, at which he happened to have worked.

After all, what happened in the Swiss capital? Through the joint efforts of delegations from many countries, a solid document was worked out there on human contacts. However, it has not gone into effect exclusively due to the stance of the U.S. delegation, which made use of the right of veto at the very last moment. In this connection, one is unintentionally reminded of a statement made by President Reagan: Speaking from the rostrum of the United Nations he assured the assembly that -- and I quote -- the U.S. Government regards concern for human rights as the moral focus of all U.S. foreign policy; hypocrisy, once again.

[Volskiy] Vadim Borisovich, you have just recalled that in his conversation with you, Ambassador Kashlev spoke about the way in which Washington. . . the gloomy note on which Washington ended the Bern meeting. But obviously, it did not begin the meeting with good intentions either. You remember, of course, the huge number of people they gathered together there during the beginning of the Bern conference and even before it. They set up a real anti-Soviet witches' sabbath, so to speak, under the banner of the crusade which was proclaimed by President Reagan some time last year or the year before, or 2 years ago. Do you know the name Ivan Agruzov, for example?

[Kassis] Yes, naturally. He, as a matter of fact, was also in Bern, but I happened to meet that functionary of the reactionary people's labor union once in Frankfurt-am-Main. A traitor to the motherland who served in Hitler's gendarmerie, he opened a so-called international human rights society in that city some time ago, naturally with the assistance of the United States' and Federal Republic of Germany's secret services. I will not expand on Agruzov's activities, but merely mention that he regards the renegades Ginzburg, Bukovskiy, and Solzhenitsyn as his idols; he is against the peace struggle, but supports the brutal Chilean junta; he is against the showing of films about the persecution of people of goodwill, etc. I was in Frankfurt one again 1 and 1/2 months ago; I visited the town hall and remembered that it was in that very town hall that the reactionary Agruzov had recently been presented with a West German order for his services. I wanted to see what the butcher looked like with an order in his buttonhole and phoned his office. No meeting took place, however: He had called in sick. It was a great shame because I had a thing or two to say to him.

[Andrianov] So, I think it is quite clear to our listeners just who in fact is campaigning for human rights. On that, we conclude our roundtable meeting. All the participants thank you, esteemed comrade listeners, for your attention. All the best.

DEMICHEV RECEIVES YUGOSLAV, JAPANESE FIGURES

LD062220 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the Kremlin today, Comrade Demichev received a delegation of the Assembly of the Yugoslav Socialist Republic of Macedonia led by Stavrev, president of the republic's Assembly. The conversation took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Also today, Comrade Demichev received Watanabe, president of the Japanese newspaper company Hokkaido Shimbun, at the latter's request.

REAGAN RECEIVES ARISTOV; TRADE PROTOCOL SIGNED

PM081527 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Text] The ninth session of the joint Soviet-U.S. Commercial Commission completed its work in Washington on 5 December. During the session the Soviet delegation had meetings with Secretary of State Shultz, Secretary of Commerce Baldridge, Secretary of the Treasury Baker, Secretary of Agriculture Lyng; with Yuetter, U.S. representative at the trade talks; with Dole, leader of the Republicans of the Senate; and other officials.

The head of the Soviet delegation, Boris Aristov, minister of foreign trade; and Yuriy Dubinin, USSR ambassador to the United States, were received by U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

At meetings and sessions of the commission the sides voiced their support for the development of trade and for looking jointly for ways of expanding it.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 2143 GMT on 5 December 1986, in an otherwise identical report on the Reagan-Aristov meeting, adds the following five paragraphs:

"Special attention was devoted to discussing the possibilities for expanding businesslike cooperation between the two countries under measures being carried out in the USSR for perfecting the management of foreign economic ties. Both sides expressed the opinion that the restructuring of foreign economic activity being implemented in the Soviet Union might have great importance for the development of Soviet-U.S. trade.

"The Soviet side drew attention to the need for the U.S. side to remove the various obstacles, limitations and prohibitions in the path of developing mutual trade which have accumulated over a number of years, above all for the extension of Soviet exports to the United States. The need to create conditions for a more balanced trade between the USSR and the United States was stressed, and attention was drawn to the fact that the prospects for bilateral trade as a whole and purchases by the USSR in the United States will to a large extent be determined by the volume of Soviet goods exported to the U.S. market. The sides agreed to work on searching for mutually acceptable solutions in removing some obstacles in the path of Soviet exports to the United States. The U.S. side proposed to consider the issue of holding exhibitions of Soviet goods in the United States.

"During the session much attention was devoted to issues of extending contacts and improving the conditions of commercial activity for business circles of both countries. It was stressed that the development of Soviet-U.S. commercial and economic relations might facilitate a strengthening of confidence between the two countries.

"The Soviet delegation explained to the U.S. side the USSR's position with respect to joining GATT.

"On the whole the work of the commission took place in a businesslike atmosphere. A protocol was signed on its results. By mutual agreement the next session of the commission will be held in 1987 in Moscow."]

BALDRIDGE: U.S. WANTS TO IMPROVE TRADE RELATIONS

LD071158 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1123 GMT 7 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow, 7 Dec (TASS) -- The United States wants to improve its trading relations with the USSR, and indeed all our relations with the Soviet Union as a whole, stated U.S. Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldridge. An article by him has been published in an advertising and informational supplement to EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA, which was prepared by the newspaper's editorial office, by U.S. business circles, by the JOURNAL OF COMMERCE and by the USSR Foreign Trade Advertising Association [Vneshtorgreklama].

I would also like to stress, writes Baldridge, that trading links with the Soviet Union cannot be examined separately from our overall relations. The relations between the two super-powers are dominated by politics and security problems, and what happens in trade depends directly on the nature of our relations as a whole. Trade can assume a leading position, without at the same time leaving the other component elements of our relations too far behind. A fundamental improvement in trade cannot take place without a parallel improvement in other spheres of interstate links.

Since there can be no substantial improvement in trade matters without progress in other areas, some might say that there are very few opportunities for expanding trade between the United States and the Soviet Union, if there are any at all. I do not agree. The monitoring of exports that is being carried out in the interests of national security, for example, is not hindering the expansion of bilateral trade in many goods and services. Trade in many goods is not restricted in the United States, and so they can be freely sold to the Soviet Union.

Last year, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade supplied us with a list of 33 kinds of enterprises that had been earmarked for purchase in the West. In 32 cases, American firms could have supplied them to the Soviet Union with all their equipment, including the systems for controlling the production process, just like the new plants that are coming into operation this year in the United States.

Bearing our possibilities in mind, we are actively thinking of an expansion in peaceful trade.

ARMAND HAMMER'S MEETINGS WITH OFFICIALS NOTED

Meets With Shevardnadze

PM081609 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 3

[Text] On 6 December E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Foreign Minister, received Armand Hammer, an eminent representative of U.S. business circles, at the latter's request.

During the conversation that took place E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that Soviet-U.S. relations are now at such a stage that particularly crucial decisions are required in favor of a real turn toward reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons and not allowing an arms race in space and toward constructive interaction and cooperation in various fields. The Soviet Union firmly stands on the positions of the accords reached during the summit in Reykjavik which opened up an historic opportunity for a radical solution to the issues of war and peace.

However, the U.S. side, E.A. Shevardnadze said, adheres to a directly contrary approach, having unleashed a campaign of attacks on Reykjavik and of virtually undermining its results. This is confirmed by the demonstrative breach by the U.S. Administration of such a fundamental agreement in the sphere of security as the SALT II treaty.

It was pointed out that, while consistently favoring the all-round development of relations with the United States, the Soviet Union decisively insists that they be based on the principles of equality, mutual advantage and inadmissibility of any sign of discrimination, including trade.

For his part, A. Hammer expressed hope that the persistent efforts for the benefit of peace and mutual understanding will continue and that the positive aspects of Reykjavik will not be wasted. He reaffirmed the interest of U.S. business circles in a fuller utilization of the existing possibilities and the development of new and promising forms of economic cooperation with the USSR.

Received by Ryzhkov

PM081205 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 86 First Edition p 2

[Text] -- Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, received in the Kremlin on 6 December Armand Hammer, president and chairman of the board of the U.S. company "Occidental Petroleum" on his request.

During the exchange of views on Soviet-American relations it was noted that the meeting of the leaders of both countries in Reykjavik, by charting a realistic road to a nuclear-free future, had opened up unprecedented opportunities for resolving most urgent problems facing mankind. That is why the central task in relations between the two countries, and of the entire international community, as well, is to preserve the positive element of Reykjavik and to obstruct efforts of the enemies of nuclear disarmament to hurl the world back to the positions without prospects. The Soviet Union wholly and totally stands for advancing on the basis of what has been achieved and searching jointly for mutually acceptable agreements.

Headway on key security issues, Nikolay Ryzhkov said, would have a favorable impact on the entire complex of Soviet-U.S. relations, including the commercial and economic sphere. Vast plans for the socio-economic development currently implemented in the Soviet Union and the switch to new forms of cooperation with other countries created favorable conditions for the expansion of commercial and economic ties. However, Washington's discriminatory policy and all kinds of artificial bans and restrictions remained a stumbling-block in relations with the United States in that field.

Armand Hammer reaffirmed the growing interest of American business in an improved business cooperation with their Soviet foreign trade partners, especially involving the use of new forms of economic ties. Of decisive importance for that would be an improvement of the political atmosphere in relations between the two countries and their steps toward the realization of the possible accords that appeared in Reykjavik and deal with fundamental questions of war and peace.

The sides also examined concrete measures for the further development of bilateral cooperation between Soviet organizations and Occidental Petoleum Corp., including matters related to the establishment of joint enterprises. V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and N.D. Komarov, first deputy minister of foreign trade, took part in the conversation.

DANILOFF BOOK BREAKS 'GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT'

PM041235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 6

[Article written for IZVESTIYA by TASS observer Viktor Ponomarev under the rubric "The Background of Events": "What Is the Worth of a 'Gentlemanoff's' Morals"]

[Text] Nicholas Daniloff, correspondent of the American magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, has written a book about the depth of his Russian roots, stretching back to the Decembrist Frolov. He wrote it a long time ago, secretly hoping that the U.S. reading public is sufficiently well informed of the achievements of modern genetics and can draw, without any prompting, parallels to his advantage: Back in the past we have a free thinker and seeker for truth, sent by the tsar in a marching column from Senate Square straight to Siberia; today we have a genuine American patriot and gentleman, direct descendant of the Russian Decembrist.

But Daniloff evidently miscalculated as regards publishers perspicacity, and wandered about with his manuscript for quite a long time. It kept being returned to him, and the author's hopes dwindled. Printing presses hummed as they worked overtime, filling bookstore shelves with "socially commissioned literature" -- "The Russians Are Coming," "Red Dawn," and other horror stories about the "Soviet threat" and the "Russians' treachery." Who had any time for "Decembrists!" And so the manuscript would have remained stacked up among the journalists other papers had he not suddenly "struck lucky": Daniloff was caught red-handed in Moscow while carrying out an espionage operation and, in accordance with Soviet law, spent several weeks under investigation. Having grasped the point that no one would buy unless you do some hard selling, the Decembrist's offspring treated his arrest as "sabbatical leave" and, once freed, wrote an additional chapter for his unsellable book. This chapter convered his own "ordeals" in Russia, the motherland of his distant ancestor.

This time the publishers got the hint, and the book became a hot property. The broad U.S. public will soon become a hot property. The broad U.S. public will soon become familiar with the family tree of the gentleman from U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, because the mixture of Russian history and the U.S. spy's "memoirs spiced with fantasy" and jailhouse "titillation" promise the publishers both financial and political dividends.

Not having the opportunity to leaf through the manuscript, but being sufficiently familiar with its author's personality through his published writings and his behavior at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center, we decided to embark on our own travels up Mr Daniloff's family tree and along his espionage paths in Moscow.

Having spent quite a few days in the V.I. Lenin Library's reading rooms, having leafed through all sorts of archive material, having listened to many people who were closely acquainted with the Russian Decembrist's offspring during his two tours of duty in Moscow, we acquired an even stronger belief in the miracles of genetics. A man lives his life and has absolutely no idea that yesterday he resembled a distant forebearer, today his great-grandfather, and tomorrow, who knows, maybe his grandfather or his "beloved papa...."

No, Daniloff does not lie at all when describing his kinship with the Decembrist Frolov. His grandmother, born a Frolova, was indeed the latter's own granddaughter. But our tiring search through the archives was suddenly crowned by a sensational discovery.

Tsarist secret police investigation file No 448 on A.F. Frolov revealed that Daniloff's valiant ancestor testified in the course of the investigation that he had joined the Decembrist Society "to emulate and through a desire to please his company commander Tyutchev, and wanted to inform on them later on...."

The things these damned genes do to man! Later on the reader will find out who the "company commander" was that Frolov's American offspring wanted to please. It has already been proved, however, that Daniloff was a member of the secret society of "cloak and dagger knights," and that, in contrast with his forebearer, he did manage to "inform" on many of his CIA colleagues. But more about this later. We will not try to guess whether Laniloff is now demanding a promotion, but we do know for sure from the archives that his ancestor, toward the end of his life, wrote to Tsar Aleksandr II about his sentiments as a loyal subject and, toward the end of his letter, said something about the grant of a state pension.

Case files from the long-forgotten past.... It may be difficult to seek them out and leaf through them, but it is also instructive. Therefore, let us go on with the meticulous study of the family tree, in other words the origins and the process of development of this offspring of former Russian citizens.

His grandfather -- General Yuriy Danilov -- is shown on one archive photograph standing proudly next to Tsar Nikolay II and N.N. Yanushevich, chief of general staff of the tsar's army. He would later be present at the tsar's abdication from the throne, and later still would advocate the restoration of the death penalty on the fronts and the continuation of the war against Germany. He would bitterly hate Soviet power.

Science has hitherto not confirmed our guess that the most malicious feelings of ancestors also shape the most durable genes of their descendants. But was it not these genes in Daniloff the correspondent that urged him to write malicious items not only against things Soviet but also against things Russian? Was it not they that inspired him to damage his ancestral homeland in matters that had absolutely nothing to do with journalism? Following the bloody tracks of General Danilov, war minister in Kolchak's "government" and later on the staff of Baron Wrangel, you can clearly discern the path traveled by this less romantic ancestor of the present U.S. journalist in the Balkans, where he escaped with the remnants of the White Guard rabble that were crushed by the Russian people. Having treated the bumps and bruises, having lost riches and power, nurturing bitter hatred for Soviet Russia, he arrived with his wife in Paris, where he met his son Sergey.

The son had made his way there from Rome, where staff members of the tsarist embassy, together with "Third Section" fiscal inspectors, found themselves without a job when the Great October Socialist Revolution dawned on Russia. Having gone to ground in Paris, Sergey Danilov resurfaced only after World War II. It would be pointless to seek his name in the lists of "Maquis," heroes of the French Resistance, which contain quite a few true Russian patriots: He lacked the right genes! Nevertheless, financed with money from an emigre foundation, he graduated from Harvard, married an American woman, and took up permanent residence in the United States in 1952. At that time their son Nicholas would have been 18 years old, but it would be some time before the "ff" was tagged to the end of his Russian surname.

According to the laws of genetics, corrupt genes are not always passed on to one's descendants. They only thrive under favorable conditions. The environment of the descendant of a bloodthirsty general and a Rome tax collector did not swarm with rabid white emigres alone. They were joined by a "second wave" of Nazi hangers-on and Vlasovites.

Nicholas came here "on reconnaissance" in 1961, introducing himself thus: "Danilov. New correspondent for UPI." The unassuming lean young man, not yet with two "f"s to his name, was to insist that his name was Nikolay, or rather, simply Kolya. Like one of us. He would become a constant guest of APN and try to ingratiate himself with people and flatter them, trying to get to know Soviet journalists, joking that he was not to be confused with another Russian -- Nikolay Nikolayevich Danilov, then leader of the APN editorial office. The two "f"s were not to appear at the end of his surname for almost 20 years when he was a correspondent for the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT.

He would come here not just to take part in ideological subversion but also to carry out missions for another descendant of a former Russian national, Murat Natirboff. His father, Islam-Girey Natyrbov, a former colonel of an "irregular division" and later staff captain of the Cherkassy cavalry regiment in the counterrevolutionary gangs of General Kaledin and, subsequently, Denikin, only just escaped from the Crimea to Turkey, too. Unable to speak the language and with no job, the ex-colonel was to become a circus artiste and for a small fee would perform daredevil riding stunts. He was recruited by Caucasian nationalists and went to New York where in an atmosphere of hatred for Soviet Russia Islam-Girey's son, Murat Natirboff, who became a student of Texas and Columbia universities and future staffer and, later, resident agent of the CIA in Moscow, grew up.

Daniloff would hardly describe this "company commander" in the completed chapter of the book for fear of legal prosecution for mentioning the name of a professional spy. Such a law has already been passed in the United States and works very effectively, to the shame of the "free press." Nor would he mention any other Russian emigres who are being involved increasingly actively by the CIA and the FBI in work hostile to the USSR. U.S. newspapers are dotted with timid admissions on this score. We are absolutely sure that he would not reveal the most important details about his period under investigation. We, too, would have remained silent, had Daniloff not now begun once more inflicting cock-and-bull stories on all and sundry about the nature of his espionage work and the conditions of his period under investigation.

"Let us be gentlemen," was how he persuaded the investigator. "Let our conversations remain between us alone."

Two instincts were conflicting within him at that time: Either irrefutable evidence would expose him as a liar and his reputation as a gentleman would be thoroughly tarnished (after all, "gentlemen do not lie!"), or he himself would have to admit to activity totally unrelated to journalism. He chose the latter course, because he wanted to remain a gentleman. Voluntarily, under no duress, he told the investigation team everything. And, in passing, he urged his relatives and staffers at the U.S. Embassy who visited him to accept his failure and "not to rock the boat." In other words, in ordinary language, not to turn the banal spy story into a universal scandal. He assured them that he would be kept in privilegled conditions and that he needed nothing. He even refused food and medicine parcels.

Concerned to prevent a single false word from creeping into his testimony, he described his secret deeds, gave the names and offices of CIA staffers posing as diplomats, and painstakingly rechecked what was written in the record of the proceedings. [paragraph continues]

Only when he was sure that the account was accurate did he sign it.

This is not our invention. They are his own words at the press conference held at the U.S. Embassy on his release. Thanking the two countries' leaders for their involvement in his fate and reluctance to let Soviet-U.S. relations be encumbered by an espionage provocation, Daniloff spoke most favorably of the Soviet investigation system, whose representatives, in his own words, were absolutely honorable, as befits gentlemen.

Although many of the foreigners taking part in the meeting did not like this, his comments were attributed to the objectively and decency of the gentlemen from the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT.

"No! Let us be gentlemen," the investigator himself said to me, when I tried to elicit something from the transcript of the gentlemen's evidence. "At Daniloff's request we gave our word: In response to his sincerity we will not publish the written record signed by him unless it is necessary."

So all that is left is to wait for the book to appear. We must wait and see what it has to say. But judging by the fuss surrounding the upcoming publication, the manuscript has clearly been designed to satisfy anti-Soviet tastes. Daniloff himself seems to be in a hurry to release us from the "gentleman's agreement." Perhaps he already sees himself with a tidy sum in the bank and at the same time hopes to use anti-Sovietism to win the reputation of a classic writer of modern American emigre literature.

Alas, he is not the first and he will not be the last to try to barter his honor and organize a fuss of this kind. Mark Twain, the real classic writer of American literature, used to say on this score that noise proves nothing: Even a hen laying an egg clucks as though she were giving birth to a small planet.

CONTINUING COVERAGE OF U.S.-IRAN ARMS DEALS

Reagan 'Sabotage' Effort

LD051904 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Text] Washington December 5 TASS -- President Reagan has actually called on members of his administration to sabotage the investigation into the covert U.S. arms sales to Iran and the diversion of the profits to Nicaraguan contras.

This is the assessment current here of his attempt to justify the refusal by two men in charge of the Iranian operation to testify before the Senate Select committee on Intelligence assigned to inquire into "Irangate."

The men in question are John Poindexter, former adviser to the President on national security, and Oliver North of the National Security Council staff.

The President said in a talk with journalists that there was nothing unusual in their behaviour. Such things happened in the past, he added.

Asked whether he would recommend to members of the Cabinet not to resort to such tactics, the President replied that everyone would have to take a decision on one's own in the same way as those two did.

News analysts link Ronald Reagan's remarks with the intention of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to summon a number of Cabinet ministers to give testimony.

The CBS television network observed that those might be Secretary of State George Shultz, CIA director William Casey and Chief of the White House Staff Donald Reagan.

The remarks by the head of the administration are also assessed as an attempt to prevent new revelations, unfavourable for the administration, like those made at the committee hearings by former national security adviser Robert McFarlane, one more person involved in the Iranian operation.

THE NEW YORK TIMES quoted him as saying that President Reagan gave advance approval to the sale of arms to Iran, despite administration assertions to the contrary.

THE NEW YORK TIMES said that McFarlane took issue with assertions by Attorney General Edwin Meese who said last week that Mr Reagan had only been informed "generally" after the first shipment took place.

The adminstration's clear unwillingness to cooperate with Congress makes the legislators only more determined to hold as extenisve an inquiry as possible into the White House's Iranian adventure.

Senator Robert Byrd, to become the leader of the State Democratic majority in January, announced that a special panel would be set up in the Senate to investigate "Irangate" similar to the one which inquired into the Watergate affair.

A similar panel would be created at the House of Representatives, CBS reported.

The political scandal in Washington and the unseemly facts of the White House's activity that were revealed as the scandal grew are a telling blow to the White House's prestige.

The U.S. Farmers Association has called for Reagan's impeachment for violating American laws. Its resolution said that the President breached law by launching a cover war against Nicaragua.

Speakes To Resign

LD051933 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 5 Dec 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpts] In Washington, attention is centered around the so-called "Irangate" -- the ever-growing scandal over the revelations about secret deliveries of U.S. arms to Iran. The U.S. press today front paged the news of the forthcoming resignation of White House Press Secretary Larry Speakes.

Officially, he is taking up a job in a large New York company, but who could possibly believe that it is all just a question of Speakes, like a true American, wanting to earn more dollars? His work as President Reagan's main press spokesman was just too thankless. This has been the case throughout all of Speakes' 6 years in the White House, but things have been particularly tough over the past few weeks.

Judge for yourselves: Here's part of the shorthand report of Speakes' comments at the latest White House briefing, where he was literally bombarded with questions about the details of "Irangate":

I, answered Speakes, know nothing about that. I have no opportunity of find out. I do not know whom to ask about that. Poindexter has already gone; Oliver North was in the President's office only a few times and did not inform him.

As you can see, it is not easy to stonewall like that, while mentioning only the two White House functionaries who have been chosen as scapegoats: The former presidential adviser on national security, Admiral Poindexter, and his closet assistant, Lieutenant North.

Incidentally, it is by no means just Larry Speakes who is in a tight spot at the moment in Washington. One could hardly envy Vice Predident Bush, for example, who is expected to run for presidential office at the next election in 1988. Bush maintained a stubborn silence over "Irangate" for several weeks, but in the end he was obliged to confess that errors were committed and that trust in the administration has suffered. The U.S. press sees this speech by Bush as an attempt by him to dissociate himself from "Irangate", which is being given the name "Reagangate" more and more frequently.

Indeed, it is now not only a question, or perhaps even not so much a question of U.S. arms deliveries to Iran, but of the whole character and style of the current Washington adminstration's foreign policy. After all, the further things go, the more and more obvious it becomes that the U.S. secret services have delivered, and are still delivering, weapons, not only to Iran, but to the Nicaraguan contra gangs, the Afghan dushmans and the Angolan antigovernment group UNITA as well. [passage omitted]

Reagan Admits 'Mistakes'

LD071306 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 7 Dec 86

[Text] Washington December 7 TASS -- The White House has made another attempt to take the edge off a scandal over its gross interference in the Iran-Iraq conflict and the funding of Nicaraguan contras with proceeds from arms sales to Iran.

In his Saturday radio address on the subject, President Reagan has admitted for the first time, according to the press, that "mistakes wre made" in his policy towards Iran.

He also conceded that most Americans were "disappointed" and "confused" with the exposures of the last few weeks.

Many commentators agree that it is his awareness of this circumstance as well as the blistering criticism of the White House by Congress circumvented in the shadowy dealings with Iran and the contras that have made the President to make this late admission.

But he stopped short, THE WASHINGTON POST said, of naming the persons who had made those "mistakes" and should be brought to account for them.

He also sidestepped the numerous proofs, cited in the press, of the highest-ranking administration officials, including White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan, Vice-President George Bush and C.I.A. Director William Casey, having been involved in the illegal scheme along with the National Security Council, as well as reports that Lt.-Col. Oliver North, one of those who have taken a direct part in the "Iran-contras" operation, was the President's confidante and acted with his knowledge and blessing.

Instead of setting this straight, Reagan attempted to justify himself with ludicrous assertions that the secret arms shipments to Iran had been aimed at "bringing an end to the bloody war between Iran and Iraq".

Retiring House speaker Thomas O'Neill summed up the Reagan address as an attempt to evade personal responsibility for the "Iran-contras" gambit.

Speaking in an interview with the newspaper WASHINGTON JEWISH WEEK, he said: "My personal opinion is, I honestly believe the President knew (about the diversion of profits from the arms sales to the contras in violation of American legislation). I think this is probably one judgment the President made on his own, and the judgment was wrong."

TASS NOTES 15TH TEST LAUNCH OF MX MISSILE

LD052116 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Text] San Francisco December 5 TASS -- The United States conducted another test of the latest MX intercontinental missile. The UPI news agency reports that the missile was launched from the U.S. Air Force Base Vandenberg, California, toward an atoll in the Pacific situated at a distance of some 6.5 thousand kilometres (4,000 miles).

A spokesman for the Air Force said the test had been a success. This is the 15th launching of the MX missile since 1983. The deployment of MX missiles will be started this month at the launch pads in the area of Cheyenne, Oklahoma. [as received]

RYZHKOV MESSAGE TO SOVIET-JAPANESE ROUNDTABLE

PM080857 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 86 First Edition p 1

[Message by Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov to Soviet-Japanese Roundtable]

[Text] To the participants in the Fifth Roundtable of Representatives of the Soviet and Japanese Public:

I greet the representatives of the Soviet and Japanese public taking part in the Fifth Roundtable Conference on the theme "The Role of the USSR and Japanese Public in Ensuring Peace and Security in the Asian and Pacific Region."

The problems submitted for discussion by the conference are prompted by life iteself. Their formulation indicates the growing disquiet of the Soviet and Japanese public over the fate of the world and reflects a desire on the part of the peoples of the USSR and Japan to establish genuine, good-neighborly relations.

Nuclear energy, which through human genius has been extracted from the microworld, has proved to be clad in a sinister covering of nuclear weapns, which threaten life itself on earth. The people of Japan were the first to experience these weapons' destructive force. There are still witnesses of the terrible events in Hiroshima and Nagasaki alive, and it is the task of all peace-loving forces to prevent this happening again. If a new tragedy were to occur, it would be a catastrophe not just for one city or one people but for all the inhabitants of the world. The cause of saving civilization affects everyone today and must become the concern of everyone.

In the nuclear weapons age, no one can ensure security for himself by relying on the threat of force and encroaching on other peoples' security. The Soviet Union has put forward an extensive program for phased reduction of nuclear weapons and their elimination by the beginning of the 21st century and a package of other specific proposals designed to provide all peoples with reliable guarantees of peaceful development. In order to bring these goals nearer, our country has taken a major practical step -- for almost 18 months now it has adhered to a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

The Soviet Union's sincere desire for a world free of nuclear and space weapons was convincingly confirmed in Reykjavik, which marked a qualitatively new step in the struggle for a world free of nuclear weapons. We now know that it is possible to dispose of nuclear weapons even within this generation's lifetime. Our proposals were not accepted in their entirety by the Americans, but they remain in force. The Soviet Union's honest and just stance enjoys a positive response among the peace-loving public of all countries.

The present meeting of representatives of the Soviet and Japanese public is designed to contribute to strengthening good-neighborliness and mutual understanding between our peoples and to promote the cause of developing cooperation among all the countries of Asia and the Pacific. The Soviet Union considers it important that this extensive area be actively involved in the general process of creating an international security system. Our proposals are directed toward ensuring that Asia and the Pacific be gradually turned into a zone of peace and security, a zone of equal and mutually beneficial cooperation, through the concerted efforts of the countries and the peoples of that region.

The Soviet Union attaches great significance to developing ties with Japan. Positively evaluating the signs of improvement in Soviet-Japanese relations that have emerged, we consider that there are quite a few potential opportunties to further expand them in many areas. Given goodwill and a desire for a dynamic and realistic policy, these opportunities can be realized in mutually beneficial agreements and accords.

I wish conference participants successful and productive work. I voice the hope that your noble activity activity will contribute to creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding in Soviet-Japanese relations and will help strengthen peace in Asia and the Pacific.

N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

VOSS, KOVALENKO MEET JSP CHAIRWOMAN 5 DEC

OW071117 Moscow in Japnaese to Japan 1200 GMT 6 Dec 86

[Text] Voss, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Kovalenko, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department, are currently in Tokyo, and they paid a visit to the Japanese Socialist Party [JSP] headquarters and held talks with JSP Chairwoman Takako Doi on 5 December. At the meeting, the two sides exchanged views on various international issues and on further promotion of exchanges between the CPSU and the JSP.

On the same day, talks were also held between Voss and Kovalenko, on the one hand, and Ikeda, honorary president of the Sokagaku-kai, on the other. At the talks, views were exchanged on various major issues in international politics, and on cooperation in the struggle for peace and internatonal security.

POTENTIAL FOR JAPANESE ECONOMIC EXCHANGES VIEWED

OW040523 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 3 Dec 86

[Commentary by Economic Commentator Alekseyev]

[Excerpts] Listeners, General Secretary Gorbachev's recent friendly visit to India has once again indicated that the USSR is positive in its approach to economic exchanges with various countries, regardless of social systems. Moscow Radio Economic Commentator Alekseyev writes about this as follows:

During the current visit, a new agreement was signed on economic, scientific, and technological cooperation, the most extensive cooperation agreement ever signed in the history of USSR-Indian relations. The history of economic cooperation between the USSR and India indicates that many achievements can be made in economic cooperation if only it is carried out on the basis of mutual benefit and respect for the partner's interests. Greater achievements can be made under objective conditions favorable to the promotion of economic, scientific, and technological exchanges. [passage omitted]

Incidentally, there are cases in which it is not necessary to look for such favorable conditions, as they are right in front of you. What remains to be done is to hold talks on how these conditions can be turned to mutual benefit.

One of the most typical cases is the possibility of economic exchanges between the USSR and Japan, including the exploitation of the natural resources in Siberia and the Soviet Far East. The Soviet economic program anticipates dynamic development in these regions. [passage omitted]

The realization of the Soviet Far East development program is naturally based mainly on the resources in this region. Meanwhile, the USSR does not exclude participation in the program by concerned foreign countries. Needless to say, participation is based on mutual benefit. The possibilities for promoting economic cooperation in the Soviet Far East with foreign countries are almost unlimited. During the 1960's, Japan became the pioneer in promoting economic cooperation with the USSR through a form of compensation, in other words, some products of an enterprise are used as part of its payment for the cooperation rendered in establishing that enterprise. Nine joint USSR-Japan projects on exploiting forestry and coal resources in Siberia and the Soviet Far East have either been completed or are still in progress. The supply of products provided through these projects has accounted for a remarkable portion of Soviet-Japanese trade for more than 2 decades. [passage omitted]

The possibility for very extensive cooperation, of mutual benefit to the USSR and Japan, can also be noted in the economic development in the region along the BAM railway. Proposals have been made for Japanese enterprises' participation in the economic development in the eastern part of the USSR. Many concrete projects have been worked out, but there still remain a few problems concerning Japanese enterprises' extensive participation in these projects. However, the USSR has always been seeking the best form of expanding dialogue on mutual benefit with its neighbor in the Far East. What has become the recent focus of attention is the possibility of establishing joint productive ventures with Japanese enterprises, and of strengthening technological exchanges.

Whether this possibility can be fully realized or not depends on the intention of both sides to promote stable and long-term cooperation. The natural resources in Siberia in the Far East provide the possibility of discovering various fields of mutual benefit, where efforts can be made and major technological experiences, as well as scientific and technological force, can be applied by the USSR and Japan, two major countries in the Pacific region making dynamic developments.

JAPAN REBUKED FOR BACKING U.S. SALT II BREACH

OW071005 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 4 Dec 86

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Excerpts] According to KYODO, Foreign Minister Kuranari, in his reply to a question raised by House of Councillors member Kubota, indicated an understanding of the U.S. breach of the SALT II ceiling.

In this connection, commentator Dmitriyev has the following comment:

The Japanese Government is again trying to get ahead of others in supporting U.S. adventurism. Even NATO member-countries have expressed concern to the U.S. Government on the breach of the SALT II treaty ceiling by the United States with completion of the work to equip its 131st B-52 strategic bomber with air launched cruise missiles -- ALCM.

Voices protesting against the violation of the SALT II treaty have been raised even in the U.S. Congress. [passage omitted]

Explaining his government's position to fall in line with this new U.S. move, which is expected to escalate the nuclear arms race, Foreign Minister Kuranari used a typically inverted logic. The foreign minister said that, as long as there is no improvement in East-West relations, the U.S. action is at this time justifiable.

Does Tokyo think that an escalation of the nuclear confrontation between East and West will contribute to improving relations? In any case, Foreign Minister Kuranari's statement shows that Tokyo, like Washington, is obsessed with a dangerous approach toward world problems, especially toward relations with the Soviet Union, an approach from a position of strength.

It is impossible to examine the U.S. decision to breach the SALT II treaty ceiling apart from the accord on the abolition of nuclear arms reached at the Reykjavik Soviet-U.S. talks. How are the two related to each other? The U.S. scrapping of the only agreement limiting the nuclear arms race amounts to nothing more than an abrogation of the Reykjavik accord, which opened unprecedentedly bright prospects for nuclear disarmament.

Immediately after the Reykjavik talks, Japan supported their results. However, it now supports Washington's act which virtually scraps the results of these talks. Is Japan not going too far in reversing its position to curry favor with Washington?

By continuing to take such an unprincipled position toward the most important problems of the world, Japan is not only losing its so-called individuality but also impairing its prestige in the eyes of the people of the world.

Foreign Minister Kuranari's statement justifying Washington's violation of the SALT II treaty runs counter to all the statements made by Tokyo so far that it would pursue disarmament. Regrettably, however, this is not a unique instance. In 1983, Japan went ahead of Washington's NATO allies by supporting the deployment of Pershing II nuclear missiles in Western Europe. It is well known in the world, particularly among Asian countries, that, when votes are taken at the United Nations on nuclear disarmament resolutions, the Japanese delegate unfailingly falls into line with the United States and votes against them.

In September, Japan decided to participate in SDI, which is aimed at the militarization of space to strengthen the nuclear force of the United States. In addition, in October Foreign Minister Kuranari tried to defend a U.S. nuclear test conducted to develop an X-ray laser weapon, a component of SDI.

It is hard to understand why the government of a country, which was first to fall victim to nuclear arms, would do this. Speaking of U.S. atomic bombs, when he assumed the foreign minister's post, Kuranari spoke of this period of history, reminiscing about the U.S. atomic bomb which was dropped in Nagasaki, his native land.

LIZICHEV MEETS WITH DPRK'S KIM IL-SONG

PM051341 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 4 Dec -- Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee and DPRK president, today received Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, who is here on a visit at the invitation of the Korean People's Army Main Political Directorate.

The importance of the Soviet-Korean summit meetings and talks held in Moscow in October 1986 for the further all-around development of the relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK and for the strengthening of combat collaboration between the two countries' servicemen was emphasized during the conversation, which was held in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Army General O Kuk-yol, member of the WPK Central Committee Politburo and chief of Korean People's Army General Staff, was present at the meeting.

Army General A.D. Lizichev was awarded the "State Flag" Order 1st Class under a DPRK Central People's Committee decree.

DPRK Reportage

For DPRK reportage on a 6-day visit to the DPRK by a delegation of political workers of the Soviet Army and Naval Fleet, headed by Aleksey Dmitriyevich Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, including his reception by DPRK President Kim Il-song, various tours, and a mass rally and speeches in Pyongyang, see the North Korea section of the 5 December Asia & Pacific DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

DPRK OFFICIAL REJECTS DAM PROJECT 'SLANDER'

LD021342 Moscow TASS in English 1239 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow, December 2 TASS -- Seeking to distract the attention of the South Korean and world public from the worsening political situation in the south of the Korean Peninsula, the Seoul authorities have been spreading of late the inventions about the Kumgangsan hydro-electric power plant now under construction in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Li Du Ryol [name as received], minister-counsellor of the Embassy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the USSR, said at a press conference today. He recalled that a campaign of repressions against the progressively-minded forces had been unleashed in South Korea.

The South Korean police arrested some 20 deputies of the National Assembly. Over 40 political and public organizations of various kinds were forcibly disbanded on the order of the authorities. Some 70,000 policemen were sent to disperse a meeting and demonstrations in Seoul last Saturday. Over 2,000 demonstrators were arrested. Many of them are facing the threat of a trial and a long prison term.

The South Korean propaganda asserts that by the construction of a hydro-electric power plant on the Pukhan river, Kang Won Province, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea seeks to 'flood' Seoul and disrupt the 1988 Olympics planned to be held in 1988.

The Seoul authorities maintain that the construction of the dam of the hydro-electric power plant will result in the upsetting of the ecological balance in the Pukhan river basin and will create a threat to the water supply of a vast area of South Korea adjacent to the demilitarized zone.

According to the minister-counsellor, all these allegations, the same as the recent inventions about the state of health of the North Korean leader, are nothing but malicious slander. The Kumgangsan hydro-electric power plant is being built for the purpose of improving the nature of the country. It is a peaceful project which has nothing to do with military objectives.

KIM IL-SONG, MONGOLIA'S BATMONH SPEAK AT RALLY

PM051133 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendship Rally"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 21 Nov -- The leaders of the DPRK and the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] have declared their full support for the Soviet foreign policy initiatives.

Speaking at a Korean-Mongolian rally held here in honor of a visiting MPR party and state delegation, Kim Il-song noted that the bold, constructive initiatives on problems of reducing nuclear armaments put forward by the USSR at the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik meet the demands of our times. He stressed the withdrawal of U.S. forces and nuclear weapons from South Korea is essential for relaxation of the tension in Korea and its independent, peaceful unification.

It is more important now than ever before to strengthen collaboration among socialist states in the struggle to eliminate the nuclear threat and ensure lasting peace, J. Batmonh said in his speech. The recent Moscow working meeting of the leaders of the fraternal parties of the CEMA socialist countries is of exceedingly great importance for this. The Mongolian leader went on to say that the real ways to create an all-embracing system of security in the Asia-Pacific region were indicated by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev in his Vladivostok speech.

J. Batmonh declared solidarity with the Korean people's struggle for peace and national unity on the Korean peninsula.

PROTOCOL ON 1987 TRADE SIGNED WITH MONGOLIA

PM051531 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under rubric "Official Reports"]

[Text] Talks between the USSR and Mongolian trade delegations, as a result of which a protocol was signed on trade and payments between the two countries in 1987, came to a close in Ulaanbaatar on 4 December. The protocol envisages further development in USSR exports of machines and equipment, basic forms of energy, and consumer goods to Mongolia. Mining and industrial products and light industrial and livestock goods will form the bulk of Mongolian exports to the USSR. The protocol devotes particular attention to further improving the activity of the "Erdenet" and "Mongolsovtsvetmet" joint Soviet-Mongolian enterprises and other joint projects.

A protocol was also signed on the servicing of Soviet equipment in 1986-1990. It envisages continuing work to expand the network of corresponding projects in Mongolia and improve the training of Mongolian specialists.

MILITARY CANTONMENT TURNED OVER TO DRA

LD081120 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT 8 Dec 86

[Text] Kabul December 8 TASS — The Soviet military cantonment in Bala Hesar fortress has been turned over in an official ceremony to the DRA Defence Ministry. The ceremony was attended by Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand, member of the Political Bureau of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers, Major General Mohammad Rafi, member of the Political Bureau of the party Central Committee, DRA defence minister, Major General Zabiulla Ziarmal, chief of the Main Political Administration of the Afghan Army, the command of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, representatives of party, government and public organisations of the DRA.

Addressing the participants in the ceremony Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand stressed that the return home of a part of the limited Soviet military contingent is evidence of the grown [in] combat power of the armed forces of the DRA, which are capable of defending on their own the gains of the April Revolution.

The DRA party and government leadership firmly supports the Soviet Union's constructive peaceable initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, including the proposals directed at a peaceful political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, the speaker stressed. We are expressing profound gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Government for the enormous and inestimable aid to the Afghan people.

The participants in the ceremony laid wreaths to the monument to Soviet internationalist servicemen who gave up their lives for the Afghan people's happy future.

DEMICHEV MEETS WITH DRA PROSECUTOR GENERAL

PM081217 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendly Conversation"]

[Text] P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received a delegation of the DRA Prosecutor's Office headed by Prosecutor General M.O. Rasekh in the Kremlin 3 December. A friendly conversation took place.

LAO LEADERS INTERVIEWED ON CONGRESS RESULTS

PM071850 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Lao leaders Phoumi Vongchivit, Phoun Sipaseut, and Sali Vongkhamsao by IZVESTIYA correspondent B. Vinogradov under the "IZVESTIYA Interview" rubric: "Laos: Pace of Renewal" -- date and place of interviews unspecified; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] December 2 marks the 11th anniversary of the proclamation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. The Fourth Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Congress, which ended recently, determined the concrete tasks for the country's development in the Second 5-Year Plan and in the long term through the year 2000. The congress characterized the present stage in Laos' development as the beginning of the period of transition to socialism. What are the characteristic features of this period? In what main areas will Lao domestic and foreign policy continue to develop?

B. Vinogradov, IVZESTIYA correspondent in Laos, put these questions to Phoumi Vongchivit, member of the LPRP Central Committee Politburo and acting president of Laos, Phoun Sipaseut, member of the LPRP Central Committee Politburo and Lao foreign minister, and Sali Vongkhamsao, member of the Politburo and secretary of the LPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Lao State Planning Committee.

The replies received by our correspondent are published below.

Phoumi Vongchivit [subhead]

Our country has begun building the foundations of a socialist society, bypassing the capitalist stage. This factor decisively determines the special conditions of the present stage. As our party's fourth congress noted, through the people's efforts and with fraternal countries' assistance, the first steps have been taken in recent years to change the appearance of the old Laos. In its very structure, Lao society is no longer what it was when we embarked on the path of socialism. But it cannot be considered completely socialist because a great role in its socioeconomic development belongs to small-scale commodity production with a clearly defined subsistence economy. That is, an economy geared mainly toward self-sufficiency.

Nevertheless, we have already accumulated considerable experience in the course of implementing socialist transformations. The correctness of the chosen course is clearly confirmed by the republic's economic successes. They were described at the congress. The improvement of the management mechanism, which correspondends to the country's real conditions, is continuing. Work to eliminate illiteracy is largely complete. At present, one-fourth of the population is studying. A new culture, socialist in content and national in form, is being molded. It may be said that the name of the new, socialist society is being born while old society is dying away. Of course, this process is complex and in many ways contradictory, but the ideas of Marxism-Leninism provide our main guide to action.

Laos has no constitution yet -- it is now being formulated -- but the basic principles of our state's organization are already well known: The leading role in the country's life belongs to the party; people's organs of state power operate centrally and locally; and the people are the main driving force of society. On that basis the congress defined the main areas of the country's socioeconomic development for the 5-year plan and the period through the year 2000.

The creation of the basis of socialism is a multifaceted task. And here particularly great importance is attached to the human factor and the training and selection of leading cadres. The congress noted that the strengthening of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes first and foremost the creation of strong party organizations which will act in close contact with the organs of people's power and social organizations. Organs of local power must become the true mouthpiece of the working people's will. Elected deputies have the duty to organize the implementation of party and government decisions in the sphere of the management of the economy and of social and public activity.

In addition to that, they do active work to propagandize advanced experience and the organization of competition among collectives and show daily concern for the people's material and spiritual life. The congress directed them toward a resolute struggle against embezzlers of socialist property, manifestations of bureaucracy and administrative arrogance, and all encroachments on working people's democratic rights. Party workers and representatives of the elected authorities must be skillful propagandists, must mobilize the masses to ensure the fulfillment of congress decisions, and must possess professional skills in the management of economic and social processes.

Life insistently dictates the need for a fundamental restructuring of the style of work, the determined repudiation of adminstrative and bureaucratic methods, and a switch to the utmost precision and the accurate analysis of the situation. These demands must become law in the activity of the organs of people's power in Laos.

Phoun Sipaseut [subhead]

As Comrade Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee, noted in his report at the congress, our people, who experienced all the burdens of the war years, paid a high price for the right to freedom and wish for a peaceful future in order to fulfill the outlined tasks for building our new society. The traditional bonds of combat solidarity and the historical experience of joint struggle against the colonialists and U.S. aggressors closely link Laos with Vietnam and Cambodia. The effective support of the fraternal countries, above all the Soviet Union, is also of tremendous significance for us.

We are well aware that the Soviet Union is our strategic ally and the reliable mainstay of all fighters for peace and social progress. As the Fourth LPRP Congress reemphasized, firm, multifaceted ties with the Soviet Union are the strategic principles of the foreign policy of our party and state. All the Lao revolution's victories are inseparable from the cooperation, support, and valuable comradely assistance of the CPSU, the Soviet state, and the fraternal people of the USSR. Reciprocal visits and the exchange of opinions between the supreme leaders of our parties and states and the successfully expanding relations of cooperation in various spheres of the economy and social life convincingly demonstrate the great cohesion and indestructible bonds of friendship linking the peoples of Laos and the Soviet Union.

Our party fully supports the Soviet Union's vitally important initiatives aimed at ending the arms race, preventing the militarization of space, and eliminating the threat of nuclear war. Together with other socialist states in Asia, we warmly welcome the constructive Soviet proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in Vladivostok aimed at transforming the Asia-Pacific region into a zone of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation.

Our country consistently advocates the peaceful solution of problems existing between states. Our constructive ideas on the question of the normalization of relations between the countries of Indochina and ASEAN are well known. They are based on the path of bilateral or multilateral talks with observance of the principle of equality and respect for mutual interests. Only that path satisfies the peoples' aspirations and the task of preserving peace and stability in Southeast Asia and throughout the Asia - Pacific region.

In our relations with Thailand, we are always ready to adhere to the principles of good-neighborliness and friendship and to develop multifaceted cooperation. Our government will do everything possible to establish relations of mutual understanding and trust between Laos and Thailand.

We have always valued friendship with the Chinese people and sincerely strive to normalize relations with the PRC on the basis of mutual respect for national interests, which fully accords with the tasks of creating a zone of peace and stability in Southeast Asia.

Laos is ready to develop ties with all countries of the world regardless of their sociopolitical system in order to make its contribution to the peoples' general struggle for peace and security on our planet.

Sali Vongkhamsao [subhead]

When ratifying the Second 5-Year Plan for 1986-1990, the Fourth LPRP Congress also determined the party's economic strategy for the period through the year 2000.

The transformation of the economic management mechanism began in the last 5-year plan. Policy in the sphere of price formation and labor remuneration was changed, a demarcation line was drawn between the functions of the central level and the provinces, and an experiment was conducted involving the transfer of a number of enterprises to socialist financial autonomy.

But at the same time we can also clearly see the shortcomings in our work. The Fourth LPRP Congress showed the utmost integrity by revealing the causes of these shortcomings and set communists the task of resolutely combating the negative phenomena which are still characteristic of some aspects of social and economic activity. Insufficient attention was paid to transferring agriculture and forestry to an industrial basis. The construction of many important irrigation projects was delayed. We still do not have enough advanced cooperatives. Labor productivity is low on many collective farms. In a number of cases the organization of the peasantry in cooperatives was affected by haste and subjectiveness. Certain omissions also occurred in the sphere of developing industry and handicrafts.

What are the main areas of Laos' socioeconomic development for the next 5-year period? By 1990 we must create a new economic structure providing the preconditions for socialist industrialization in the next period. The congress defined 11 main tasks in economic development. In particular, the gross social product is to increase by 67 percent and national income by 60 percent. Industrial production will rise by 90 percent and wages for workers and employees will rise by 24 percent. By 1990 food production should reach 2-2.2 million metric tons, of which rice will form 1.8 million metric tons. The construction of highways leading to the Vietnamese coast will be completed and the modernization of the main railroad line linking the northern and southern provinces of Laos will continue. Work will be carried out on 1,500 km of highways. The successful fulfillment of all the tasks set by the congress will considerably raise the population's living standard.

The Lao State Planning Committee, together with the Ministry of Finances and other organizations, is now engaged in formulating the "Statute on the Financing of Capital Construction," which will shortly be submitted to the Council of Ministers for examination. We must concentrate our resources on completing the construction of national economic projects already begun and prevent incomplete construction, which leads to a dissipation of resources. We must accelerate the comprehensive transfer of the economy to new methods of management, ensure the economic independence of the provinces, and introduce financial autonomy in enterprises. All these ventures envisage the need for a creative approach to the solution of economic problems and for new thinking and high professional qualities from all workers.

The party is well aware tht the projected goals can only be attained by generally mobilizing the working people's masses. The party's plans must become the plans of all the people. Because all our work is on behalf of the people and our motherland's socialist future.

SOKOLOV GREETS LAOS' KHAMTAI ON ANNIVERSARY

PM051151 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Dec 86 Second Edition p 1

[Greetings by Defense Minister Sergey Sokolsov to Lao Defense Minister Khamtai Siphandon]

[Text] To Army General Comrade Khamtai Siphandon, Lao defense minister:

Esteemed Comrade Minister!

On behalf of the Soviet Armed Forces and myself personally, I send you and all servicemen of the Lao People's Army fraternal greetings and cordial congratulations on the 11th anniversary of the proclamation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

The Lao people are greeting their national holiday in an atmosphere of increasing labor activeness created by the Fourth Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Congress. The socialist building plans that have been outlined offer the country new targets in social and economic development and in increasing defense capability. We note with satisfaction that the relations of friendship and fruitful cooperation between our peoples and armies are developing steadily in the interests of peace and socialism.

I wish the Lao People's Army personnel further successes in combat and political training and in the implementation of the Fourth LPRP Congress' decisions.

Communist greetings,
Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov, USSR defense minister

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON CHEBRIKOV VISIT TO SFRY

Meets Provincial Chairman

LD052019 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Text] Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security, who is on an official friendly visit to Belgrade, today met Milan Kucan, chairman of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia, in the city of Portoroz, Socialist Republic of Slovenia.

Departs Ljubljana For Home

LD062017 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1700 GMT 6 Dec 86

[Text] Viktor Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, who has been on an official and friendly visit to Yugoslavia, left Ljubljana today for home. At the airport the delegation of the USSR State Security Committee was seen off by Comrade Culafic, federal secretary for internal affairs, and other official personalities. Also present at the airport was Comrade Krasavin, charge d'affaires at the Soviet Embassy in the SFRY.

SOKOLOV GREETS SFRY'S MAMULA ON NATIONAL DAY

PM071922 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Nov 86 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Defense Minister Sokolov greets SFRY counterpart on national day]

[Text] To Comrade Fleet Admiral B. Mamula, SFRY federal secretary for national defense

Esteemed Comrade Federal Secretary!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own behalf I send you and all servicemen of the Yugoslav People's Army our cordial congratulations on the national festival of Yugoslavia's peoples -- Republic Day.

I express confidence that the friendship and cooperation between our peoples and armies will continue developing and strengthening in the spirit of the glorious traditions of Soviet-Yugoslav combat cooperation in the name of the cause of peace and socialism.

I wish the Yugoslav People's Army personnel new successes in military labor in the interests of further strengthening the SFRY's defense capability.

With communist greetings,

Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov, USSR minister of defense

NORWEGIAN PRIME MINISTER MEETS WITH LEADERS

Arrives 4 Dec

LD041842 Moscow TASS in English 1746 GMT 4 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS -- Norway's Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland arrived in Moscow today. As chairman of the International Commission for Environment and Development she will take part in the seventh meeting of this international commission, to be held in the Soviet capital. She was met at the airport by Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Vladimir Kamentsev and other officials.

Meets With Gorbachev

LD051913 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 86 First Edition pp 1-2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Conversation With Gro Harlem Brundtland" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev met in the Kremlin on December 5 with Gro Harlem Brundtland, prime minister of Norway and chairman of the Norwegian Labor Party.

The sides discussed in a friendly and frank atmosphere a wide range of issues including bilateral relations and international affairs.

We want, said M.S. Gorbachev, our neighbors to understand us better. We want to be friends with Norway as well. Should questions, misunderstandings arise, address us directly. We are ready to resolve them in our mutual interests. The same applies to issues connected with the continental shelf and the division of economic zones in the Barents Sea. We have no evil intent with regard to Norway. Sympathies for its people are long-standing in our country. The coolness that is observed in Norway's attitude to the Soviet Union has no justification whatsoever. It is abnormal that the two countries have not had top-level contacts for nearly 15 years.

The sides agreed to continue the dialogue and maintain constructive, meaningful ties both at state and party levels -- between the CPSU and the Norwegian Labor Party, between representatives of the CPSU and Gro Harlem Brundtland as vice president of the Socialist International.

M.S. Gorbachev, saying that this was their first meeting and that he wished that his interlocutor had a better idea of the philosophical foundations of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, set out the Soviet leadership's views of the present-day world.

The overall situation is fraught with an explosion, but it also has vast opportunities for detente and cooperation inherent in it. In order to realize them it is necessary to discard the notions characteristic of the past, that international politics can be determined by the interests of one power or of a group of powers.

Hundreds of countries with their distinctive features and distinctions have emerged on the world scene. And their right to independence, to independent politics, to their own social choices, should be taken into consideration. The violation of this fundamental rule is the source of conflicts and tension. But the Soviet Union is guided by this rule and will be upholding it everywhere and in front of everyone. In this connection, Mikhail Gorbachev characterized the significance of the visit to India, the essence of the Soviet Union's relations with that great country, relations based on unconditional equality, on respect for national dignity and the understanding of each other's interests.

Another reality that is at the basis of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is the vital need for ending the arms race. There is no time to be lost. If the military-industrial complex succeeds in involving a large part of the U.S. economy in the development of SDI, no talks will help.

The interlocutors have the common awareness of the need for joint actions in the struggle for detente. The notion of "universal security" and the notion of "joint security" advanced by the Palme Commission are actually identical.

But following Reykjavik Western Europe assumed a vague stand, Mikhail Gorbachev said. Moreover, as soon as the shift toward nuclear disarmament started, certain West European leaders took fright. And the U.S. Administration assumed a direct course of eliminating the consequences of Reykjavik. All its actions, including the latest one -- the rejection of SALT II -- leave no room for doubt to this effect.

The Soviet Union will never go back on Reykjavik. Reykjavik brought the state of affairs with the arms race to an absolutely new level, and the way from it can and must be only forward. Mme. Brundtland agreed to such a assessment.

Mikhail Gorbavhev also said that the Soviet Union does not intend to disrupt the talks on nuclear arms, losing a sense of realism. "But we shall consent to possible agreements going into operation only if we have full confidence that the ABM treaty is observed. This is, specifically, the basis for our package of mutual concessions and mutual interests. We have understanding for Western Europe's interest in the elimination of medium-range missiles but Europeans must make their contribution too. We made very serious concessions and we have a moral and a political right to reciprocity".

The question of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing, whose term of operation expires, came up for discussion. Mikhail Gorbavhev said that the Soviet leadership ponders how it should act and noted that the Western public has a tendency to make requests and demands only on the Soviet Union to continue the moratorium. Meanwhile, for some reason, they do not apply the same persistence in demanding that the United States stop explosions. And so, the following situation develops: everybody is for universal security, but it is only the Soviet Union that should wage the struggle for this with the United States. The West, too, should make readjustments in this sense, and should not count only on the Soviet Union's readjustments.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Gro Harlem Brundtland exchanged the opinions on environmental problems, on the possibilities and prospects for joint solutions to these problems on a truly international level.

Mikhail Gorbachev informed Gro Harlem Brundtland of the conclusions which the Soviet leadership had drawn from the Chernobyl accident. He expressed hope that the positive process started by the recent IAEA conference would gather strength and would help to ensure safe utilisation of nuclear energy.

Having briefly described the internal transformations in the Soviet Union as one of the principles of the dynamic foreign policy of the Soviet leadership, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out the importance of this policy for other countries as well. This policy meets with increasing understanding in the world. He had become convinced of that once again during the visit to India.

"However hard we are hindered in our endeavors, and whatever 'versions' are invented to frustrate our plans, we are convinced of the correctness of such policy and we shall persistently implement it. At the same time, no one will manage to make use of our interest in peace in order to compel us to waive our security".

"Notwithstanding the entire complexity of the situation, it is easy for us, in a certain sense of the word, to pursue this course: Our conscience is clear. We do what we say, and do not waste energy on thinking up crafty designs against the negotiating partner, and do not intend to use the confidentiality of the talks as a cover to draw him into a trap".

A large degree of mutual understanding on the main, most topical problems of disarmament and European security, as well as on environmental protection issues, the resolution of which Gro Harlem Brundtland has made great universally recognized personal contributions, was revealed during the conversation.

Present during the meeting were Anatoliy Kovalev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, Kjell Vibe, permanent deputy minister of foreign affairs of Norway, and Olav Bucher-Johannessen, the ambassador of Norway to the USSR.

Talks With Ryzhkov

LD051600 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 86 First Edition p 2

["Conversation With Norway's Prime Minister" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov met in the Kremlin 5 December with Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland who has arrived in Moscow as chairman of the International Commission for the Environment and Development to attend its seventh session.

The sides held a thorough exchange of views on various aspects of world development and Soviet-Norwegian relations.

Nikolay Ryzhkov described in detail processes of domestic development taking place in the Soviet Union following the 27th CPSU Congress, reorganizing of various aspects of the life of Soviet society, and the role of the human factor in implementing the CPSU's strategic course towards accelerating the country's social and economic development.

The Norwegian prime minister showed lively interest in the information.

Having pointed out a considerable similarity of the Soviet Union's and Norway's positions in the realization of the need to end the arms race on earth and to prevent it in outer space, to keep the Soviet-U.S. ABM treaty and to observe the SALT II treaty, Nikolay Ryzhkov and Gro Harlem Brundtland stated that the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik had marked a new qualitative stage in the work to rid mankind of nuclear weapons and had revealed a real opportunity to reach mutual understanding on the cardinal issues of our time. An urgent need to preserve and further develop the positive results of Reykjavik was emphasized.

Both sides expressed the conviction that an end to the arms race would promote a successful solution to environmental and developmental problems.

During an exchange of views on matters concerning the state of affairs in the European continent, the two sides expressed mutual readiness to promote a continuation and intensification of the All-European process and sucessful holding of the Vienna meeting.

Matters of Soviet-Norwegian relations at the present stage and particularly the state of and prospects for trade-and-economic, scientific-and-technical contacts were discussed.

Mutual interest in giving an additional impulse to Soviet-Norwegian contacts and in looking for and establishing new forms of cooperation was stated.

Nikolay Ryzhkov and Gro Harlem Brundtland reaffirmed the USSR's and Norway's intention to maintain and develop traditional good-neighborly relations, regarding them as a factor of stability in Europe's north and in the European continent as a whole.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1610 GMT on 5 December carries an otherwise identical report on the above meeting which adds the following:

"Taking part in the conversation were: on the Soviet side -- Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers' State Foreign Economic Commission; and Anatoliy Kovalev, first deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs; on the Norwegian side -- Olav Bucher-Johannessen, Norway's ambassador to the USSR, and Kjeld Vibe, permanent deputy minister of foreign affairs."]

SOVIET-NORWEGIAN FISHERIES COMMISSION MEETS

LD061114 Moscow TASS in English 0855 GMT 6 Dec 86

[Text] Oslo December 6 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Stanislav Tikhomirov:

The Soviet-Norwegian Mixed Commission on Fisheries held its 15th session in Oslo on December 1 through 5 in keeping with an intergovernmental agreement between the two countries on cooperation in this field and under an earlier understanding.

The attending delegations exchanged statistics on fish and shrimps catches in 1985 and 1986, set catch quotas for each country for 1987, and discussed and adopted a program for further joint studies of the fish resources in the Barents and the Norewegian Seas.

Leader of the Norwegian delegation G.H. Gundersen, a standing deputy fishing minister of Norway, said the exchange of opinions had been very useful and valuable.

He said both sides were satisfied with the reached understandings and intended to continue broadening their cooperation in fisheries.

The two delegations signed a protocol summing up the results of the session.

The Soviet-Norwegian Mixed Commission on Cooperation in Fisheries is to hold its next session in the fall of 1987 in the Soviet Union.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS SPEECH BY IRAN'S VELAYATI

PM081043 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by M. Seregin under the headline "Unfavorable"]

[Text] You sometimes come across surprising reports in the material circulated by the Iranian mass media. Take, for example, the report that Minister of Foreign Affairs of Iran 'Ali Akbar Velayati, speaking at Tehran University a few days ago, deemed it possible to declare that "Iran shall never agree to Soviet dominance over it." A more than surprising statement, especially considering the fact that it came from an Iranian official in whom such lofty powers in the foreign policy field are vested. What, as a matter of fact, was he talking about, what kind of dominance?

It is well known that the Soviet Union always favored and favors an improvement of relations with its southern neighbor -- Iran -- on the basis of full equality, mutual respect and nonintervention in the internal affairs of each other. Our country stands for good-neighborly relations and mutual understanding with Iran -- the striving arising from the very nature of socialism.

It is possible to cite no small number of examples testifying to this, including those related to the recent past. Suffice it to recall, for example, that the USSR welcomed the antimonarchy revolution in Iran which put an end to the rotten pro-American regime of the Shah, that the Soviet Union was one of the first to recognize the new government in Tehran; and that it supported the Iranian people at the difficult time of the economic blockade and military threats on the part of imperialism. All this is known in Iran. Moreover, the Iranian leadership itself has lately been coming out in favor of the establishment of good relations between Iran and the Soviet Union. The minister of foreign affairs of Iran more than once came out in favor of this. Such statements naturally can only be welcomed.

As for the various talk about an alleged threat of "Soviet dominance" to Iran, it surely is doing nothing for the benefit of Soviet-Iranian relations and is not in line with the current process of their development.

TRADE PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH EGYPT

LD081040 Moscow TASS in English 1028 GMT 8 Dec 86

[Text] Cairo December 8 TASS -- Negotiations on Soviet-Egyptian credit, financial, trade and economic relations were held between the government delegations of the Soviet Union and Egypt in Cairo from November 26 to December 7. During the visit the Soviet delegation was received by Egyptian President Husni Mubarak and Prime Minister 'Atif Sidqi.

The sides signed a protocol on the results of the negotiations. On the Soviet side it was signed by Viktor Dementsev, board chairman of the USSR State Bank, and on the Egyptian side -- by Yusri Mustafa, minister of economy and foreign trade.

PRAVDA SCORES WESTERN 'CONSPIRACY' AGAINST SYRIA

PM061925 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 86 First Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Conspiracy Against Syria"]

[Text] The campaign of blackmail and threats that imperialist and Zionist forces have long been waging against Syria has reached a great pitch in recent weeks.

The current outburst of anti-Syrian hysteria is "justified" by the claim that Damascus encourages international terrorists. As is well known, this thesis was invented in Washington and officially adopted by the U.S. Administration. Now it is being actively used against Syria. The grounds for organizing an outright "crusade" were provided by the abortive attempt to blow up an Israeli aircraft at London airport, an attempt with which, as the Syrian leadership stated, the country has nothing to do. Nevertheless, Britain accused Damascus of complicity in this action dating back some 6 months, severed diplomatic relations with Syria, and announced the introduction of political, economic, and other forms of "boycott."

Subsequent events have shown that this is merely the first stage in a widespread conspiracy and that Washington plays a leading role in it. At first, as though supporting Britain, the United States recalled its ambassador from Syria and, together with London, pressured the "Common Market" countries to adopt discriminatory measures against Syria, but then came out into the limelight itself by announcing "punitive sanctions" against Damascus. In the process people across the ocean began assigning to Syria responsibility not only for the "London affair" but also for many other terrorist actions, including ones in which they had only recently been accusing Libya of complicity. In an atmosphere of growing pressure from the United States, the FRG joined in the anti-Syrian campaign and, in particular, adopted a course of curtailing economic cooperation with Damascus. The West Berlin Control Council, on which the U.S., British, and French military authorities are represented, decided to expel a considerable number of Syrian nationals.

The statements by Syrian officials expressing a principled stance of condemnation of international terrorism and rejecting both the charges in connection with the provocation in London and also the other similar fabrications are being totally ignored. Washington and the allies who take their cue from it are even ignoring the fact that Syria proposed setting up an international commission to uncover terrorist activity and stated its readiness to cooperate with any state within the framework of that commission.

Moreover, there are open threats from across the ocean to carry out a military action against Syria. And, as the April attack on Libya showed, this cannot be viewed as hot air. The only difference is that this time they are encouraging and inciting Israel -- whose rulers have long nurtured the intention to strike against the Syrian troops in Lebanon as part of the general weakening of Syria, which is seeking the return of the Golan Heights seized from it in 1967 -- to begin the onslaught. And the justification of an operation as a "response to terrorist actions" is the Israeli military's usual cover for gangsterism.

Other things that attract attention in this connection are U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense W. Taft's recent visit to Israel in an atmosphere of secrecy, Washington's agreement to supply additional armaments to Tel Aviv, and the large-scale military maneuvers carried out by Israel. Seeking that the "strategic ally" is giving them the "green light," the Tel Aviv leaders are flexing their military muscle. [paragraph continues]

Prime Minister Y. Shamir has gone so far as to state: "Israel will not sit by with arms folded," and Israeli Army Chief of General Staff M. Levy has bluntly intimated that there may be a strike against Syria at any moment. All this is all the more dangerous in that the United States constantly keeps considerable armed forces in the Mediterranean -- both at bases and on ships -- in a state of readiness.

The Syrian newspaper AL-BA'TH writes that there is a carefully planned conspiracy prepared in advance, and, let us add, an extremely perfidious one. On the one hand large-scale long-term measures designed to place Syria in a certain amount of international isolation and to cause it economic difficulties are being taken. And on the other an armed action directed primarily toward destabilizing the political situation in the country and undermining the progressive regime that rules there is being prepared. All these goals are very similar to those sought during the Libyan adventure.

The identical nature of the "Libyan" and "Syrian" scenarios is no accident. In both cases it is a matter of an attempt to force Arab countries that pursue an anti-imperialist course to abandon it. Both Washington and Tel Aviv have long been seeking to break Damascus' resistance to the policy of separate deals in the Near East and to remove, in the shape of Syria, probably the most powerful obstacle to this.

One cannot help noticing that the attacks on Syria have been mounted at a time when the idea of creating a preparatory committee to convene an international conference on the Near East, with the participation of the UN Security Countrl permanent members and all interested parties in the region, is meeting with growing support in the world. Under these conditions the anti-Syrian campaign appears to be a link in the plans of Washington and other opponents of a Near East settlement, which are trying at all costs to prevent the convening of a conference.

Overall, the events surrounding Syria are another manifestation of the anti-Arab line of the Western countries, headed by the United States, which in alliance with Israel would like to impose its will on the Arab peoples. They are yet another sample of the gangsterist strategy of "neoglobalism." The conspiracy against Syria ranks alongside the Washington-supported 1982 Israeli aggression in Lebanon, the U.S. invasion of Grenada, and the U.S. undeclared war against Afghanistan and Nicaragua.

And are the U.S. actions in adding fuel to the flames of the Iranian-Iraqi conflict not similar? After all, it is clear to any sensible person that the secret U.S. weapons deliveries to Iran provoke a further continuation of the bloodshed between the two neighboring countries. Despite the Washington Administration's attempts to "justify itself," it is also clear that from the outset these deliveries were intended to fuel the conflict in order to ensure the weakening of the warring parties and accordingly to make it easier for Washington to pursue a "divide and rule" policy in an oil-rich and strategically important region.

It should be noted that the anti-Syrian campaign has been launched in a situation where the Arab world is fragmented and lacks its former unity and solidarity. This enables the neoglobalists to hatch their plans according to the well-known ploy of "beating up victims one by one." There has been a dawning realization in many Arab countries recently that urgent coordinated measures are necessary to change the prevailing situation. In particular, it is being suggested that this aim could be served by convening a Pan-Arab summit conference; such conferences before have usually adopted joint decisions to defend any Arab state from the encroachments of imperialism and Zionism. If the Arabs manage to ensure the unity of their ranks, it will certainly be an effective weapon to rebuff their enemies' intrigues.

Imperialist circles have embarked on a dangerous path in assailing Syria and threatening a sovereign Arab state with force. But they should not forget: Syria is not Grenada. And the Syrian people, who are fully determined to defend their country's independence, are not alone. They have the support of their friends and the solidarity of the broad international public on their side.

MINISTERS EXPRESS SOLIDARITY WITH PALESTINIANS

LD301734 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 30 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 30 TASS -- The Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. sent a congratulatory telegram to the Palestinian people, its vanguard and only legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, on the occasion of the international day of solidarity with the Palestinian people.

"The Soviet people express solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Palestinian people for the exercise of its inalienable right to national self-determination, and for a really just settlement in the Middle East," the telegram said.

"The guarantee of success of that struggle is the unity of the Palestinian movement on a principled anti-imperialist basis, and its cohesion with the patriotic forces of the Arab world."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES' LEADER GREETED ON ELECTION

LD041355 Moscow TASS in English 1154 GMT 4 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 4, TASS -- The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR has sent a telegram to Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Shaykh al-Nuhayyan on the occasion of his election as president of the United Arab Emirates. In his reply telegram Zayid ibn Sultan al-Nuhayyan expressed sincere gratitude for the good wishes.

BRIEFS

MAURITANIAN AMBASSADOR CREDENTIALS -- Moscow December 2 TASS -- The ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Diawara Gani, presented his credentials to Valentina Shevchenko, vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., in the Kremlin today. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 2 Dec 86 LD]

GORBACHEV ADDRESSES THEATER WORKERS 3 DEC

PM051115 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 86 Second Edition p 1

["Meeting in the CPSU Central Committee" -- KRASNAYA ZVEZDA headline]

[Text] -- On 3 December M.S. Gorbachev general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with a group of leading stage artistes and representatives of theater organizations of the union republics. They examined issues relating to the work of the theater in the new conditions, the creation of a theater union and the further escalation of the activities of all creative organizations.

Dwelling on the tasks of our country's contemporary development set by the 27th Party Congress, M.S. Gorbachev noted that the point of the restructuring is to realize the potential of each person and of all society as a whole. It is a question not of appearances or of "cosmetics," but of revolutionary transformations. We must do everything to implement the Leninist idea of creating the premises -- economic, political, ideological and moral -- in order for each person to act at full strength and to act in a socialist way.

One can say: We have already started to plow to loosen the earth, and have started to sow seeds. Later there will be the shoots and there will also be the harvest. Of course, this will require both time and effort. But I believe that this work is so necessary and so noble that the person who takes part in it can consider that he has been fortunate in life.

M.S. Gorbachev also said: To awaken all that is best in a person of Soviet society is a great humane deed, and such is the destiny of socialism. And here literature, art and the labor of our creative intelligentsia play an enormous part. We receive serious support from the intelligentsia and expect much from it now when a struggle is underway for moral renewal and for the attainment of a new qualitative state of society.

If socialist principles are to triumph completely, M.S. Gorbachev said, we need more democratization of the whole life of our country -- a process that must include all the people. But we must also not forget that democracy means self-government by the people; it does not mean that anything goes. We need democratization to strengthen the country, impart dynamism to it and prevent blunders in politics and in our practical activities. Democracy must be developed fearlessly, as must openness. That is also a Leninist principle.

Restructuring now extends to the theater. There are disputes as to what it should be like and how it is to be improved. Not everything, maybe, will be hit upon immediately; things have to be tried and tested. One of the signs of that process is the establishment of your creative union. It must assume much on its public shoulders and develop machinery for interaction with the state organs of culture.

I believe, M.S. Gorbachev continued, that now is a good time for quests. In everything constructive solutions should be sought. But I must also say that criticism permeated with general concern and anguish is in itself creative. Our most dangerous enemy is inertia, routine, complacency, the habit of working "in accordance with instructions." Restructuring thinking: That is the main difficulty. Not always and not everywhere is it proceeding painlessly. But one has to act on a large scale, aggressively and consistently, involving every person in solving the tasks of accelerating the development of our society.

M.S. Gorbachev also noted that the party intends to continue pursuing an active social policy and to promote the renewal of the forms and methods of work in the spiritual sphere. The results of the creative organizations' activities must be measured in new talented works in which real processes taking place in our life would be revealed. M.S. Gorbachev devoted much of his speech to questions of the international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Speakers at the meeting were:

-- Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee;

-- K.Yu. Lavrov, chairman of the organizing committee of the Union of Theatrical Societies.

-- M.A. Ulyanov, N.N. Yeremenko, A.M. Mambetov, B.R. Kariyeva, O.N. Yefremov, G.A. Tovstonogov and V.A. Andreyev. They spoke of the growing importance of Soviet art in present-day conditions, of the ways of overcoming existing difficulties and of the lofty civic responsibility of each artist for preserving and multiplying the country's spiritual wealth.

Taking part in the meeting were:

-- A.N. Yakovlev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and

-- Y.P. Voronov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Culture Department.

ZAGLADIN, KAPITSA ATTEND PROPAGANDA SEMINAR

PM071916 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Nov 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Seminar of Lecturers on International Affairs"]

[Text] The lofty purpose of lecture propaganda is to equip millions of working people with the ability to think in a politically mature way and to work in conditions of restructuring, and to cogently show the CPSU's activity to implement the Soviet peace program. This was stressed at an all-union seminar for lecturers on international affairs entitled "The New Philosophy of Peace and the CPSU's Foreign Policy Strategy" which ended in Moscow 28 November. It was organized by the All-Union "Znaniye" Society.

The main speakers -- V.V. Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, M.S. Kapitsa, USSR deputy foreign minister, Yu.S. Shiryayev, director of the CEMA International Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System, and M.L. Titarenko, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East Institute -- and others noted that by their specific steps in the international arena the CPSU and the Soviet state confirm their commitment to the cause of peace, the elimination of the nuclear threat hanging over mankind, and the struggle for the creation of all all-embracing system of international security. It was pointed out that the duty of lecturers and propagandists is to show thoroughly and clearly the class, international essence of Soviet foreign policy and to expose imperialism's aggressive plans and the falsity of its propaganda inventions. [paragraph continues]

In conditions of the complex international situation, the participants in the seminar stressed, it is exceptionally important to make audiences deeply aware that the better each Soviet person works, the stronger our state's international positions will be.

INVESTIGATORS OF MOLDAVIAN ABUSES OBSTRUCTED

PM031029 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent E. Kondratov article under the rubric "Publicity in the Open": "So Where Was the Prosecutor?"]

[Text] Kishinev -- The medicine may be bitter, but it is better than the disease... A month has now passed but there is still no collective in the republic which is not discussing the lesson of harsh truth -- the CPSU Central Committee resolution which made a principled appraisal of the practice of mass overreporting in Moldavia. Today this is discussed not only at plenums and meetings but also in stores and buses. The newspapers write about it. V. Kozhokaru from Kishinev expresses bewilderment in a letter to the IZVESTIYA correspondent's office: "I understand that farm and rayon leaders used overreporting to inflate their own reputation. But where were the prosecutors? Why did they keep silent?"

"Why did they keep silent?" Republican Prosecutor I. Cheban repeated the question. He went to the safe and took out a file. "Here you are. Read for yourself..."

I leafed through the documents bearing different descriptions -- report, briefing, presentation, information memorandum. All of them dated between 1980 and 1986, all of them signed by the republican prosecutor, all of them addressed to Moldavia's supreme party or soviet organs. They reported, for example, that kolkhozes in Sorokskiy, Chimishliyskiy, and Bessarabskiy Rayons were paying hundreds of thousands of rubles into procurement offices' coffers instead of the milk that should have been delivered. I learned from the documents that for months on end people in Chimishliya deliberately omitted to report that young cows had calved, presenting the milk and calves produced by them as dairy herd productivity growth. The documents summed up prosecutors' reports on major overreporting in Strashenskiy, Glodyanskiy, and Faleshtskiy Rayons...

As I read the alarming local reports I racked my brains: Why were the prosecutors so keen on the epistolary genre? Why did they write instead of taking immediate measures? And why did the information come only from some rayons? True enough, I was told that the reports came only from prosecutors who were encountering local obstacles in their struggle against overreporting. The rest worked without hindrance and therefore did not write. But I attended the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum and I know that recent inspections have revealed overreporting almost everywhere. In the horticultural and stockraising north, in the republic's vegetable-rich central region, in the grape-growing south...

Briefly, I asked myself the same question as our reader. So where was the prosecutor? I decided to personally find an answer to this question. To start with, I met Glodyanskiy Rayon Prosecutor Vladimir Grigoryevich Melnik.

It was November 1982. Young Prosecutor Melnik learned that Gagarin Kolkhoz Chairman V. Kurulyuk had committed a serious crime. Buying stolen milk from drivers from the Beltsy milk plant, he sent it back to Beltsy, but this time in kolkhoz tankers. Thus the farm's milk yields "increased" by 40,000 liters.

When the prosecutor instituted criminal proceedings in this case, people in the rayon center were amazed: After all, the kolkhoz chairman was the favorite of the "boss," the party raykom first secretary.

Indeed, on the very next day the prosecutor was asked to call on Raykom Second Secretary V. Danilov. Kurulyuk, who was under investigation, was seated in his office. "Look here, prosecutor," he said. "The case must be closed."

A day later Melnik was summoned again, this time by "the man himself," who repeated the very same words. "You have children," he added meaningfully. "And a party card... for the time being. So think it over. Meanwhile, we'll check that your own nose is clean. I'm sure you too must have transgressed."

From that moment, every day was an ordeal for the prosecutor. The rural ispolkom did not approve Kurulyuk's arrest. When the rayispolkom confirmed this decision, the prosecutor turned to the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Learning about this, Rayispolkom Chairman A. Bodyul, accompanied by his deputy, made his way to the prosecutor's office. But he did not go inside. Having had a good look around the yard in which the wind was chasing the yellow leaves, he ordered: Call in the rayon public health inspector. Let him fine the prosecutor fifty or so... Everybody understood that the fine was not the point. Melnik was simply being put in his place.

But the Maldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium overrulled the rayispolkom's decision, recommending that the question of Kurulyuk's immunity as a deputy be examined by a session. "There won't be anything for you to do at the session," Bodyul told the prosecutor. "On second thoughts, fair enough, come along. Tomorrow at 1500 hours." Melnik arrived an hour earlier, only to find that the session had been "railroaded through" an hour ago. The decision remained the same: No consent was given to the arrest.

Now the republican prosecutor himself had to approach the Supreme Soviet Presidium. Consent was obtained, Kurulyuk was arrested. The investigation process, which stretched over almost 18 months, revealed colossal overreporting, tens of thousands of rubles in downright embezzlement...

The criminal was sentenced to 10 years.

And the prosecutor was... shadowed. What time he arrived at the office, what time he left, where he went... All the indications were that the convict's patron -- the rayon "boss" -- had decided that the prosecutor must be gotten rid of at all costs. A commission suddenly descended on the house where Melnik lived: Could the prosecutor be frightened with eviction from the official residence?

On one occasion Melnik went to see the first secretary with the latest official reports on overreporting. Uninhibited by the presence of others in the office, the "boss" declared: "I don't need your denunciations. Don't let me see your face ever again!" The report and election conference did not elect the prosecutor even a candidate member of the raykom.

But Vladimir Grigoryevich carried on with his work. When he issued a prosecutor's warning to a chairman who had disguised fines by making the guilty kolkhoz members pay over money supposedly for milk which they had bought, he finally had a frank conversation with the "boss." The latter bluntly warned him not to stand in his way.

"You know," Melnik admitted, "I also had almost come to the point of deciding that the 'boss' was omnipotent. He got away with everything -- petty tyranny, carousing, fraud against the state... He personally boasted to me: Look, he said, there are 600 complaints on my desk, but everything is up to me, I can do whatever I like with them."

It was only in December 1984 that the "invulnerable boss" D. Chebotar, first secretary of the party raykom, was relieved of his duties and expelled from the CPSU. Later he was stripped of all awards and recalled from the republican Supreme Soviet. His cronies also lost their positions -- Bodyul, Danilov, and a few more Glodyanskiy Rayon leaders who had "shown special distinction" in mass overreporting. And Prosecutor Melnik survived. By proving him right, life showed yet again that in our society there is no immunity for anyone who gets drunk on power and loses a real idea of his duty to the party and to people.

I think that this story of a prosecutor's difficult confrontation with rayon authorities cannot be described as typical. It is not all that often that prosecutors' mouths have been shut by leaders who overstepped the mark and whose only law was "Because I say so." Chebotar is an odious individual. There have been, however, instances when representatives of the law that they were defending the state interests. Defending them... from the prosecutor. And this is the most alarming aspect.

"Once," I was told by Chimishliyskiy Rayon Prosecutor Ye. Bryazu (who now works in Kalarash), "I had a phone call from someone who did not give his name but told me: 'You are as much a demagogue as the rest of them.'"

The point was that Ye. Bryazu, recently appointed rayon prosecutor, very often said, in the course of inspections or when addressing kolkhoz members, that he would not tolerate window dressing and ostentation. He spoke of overreporting as a crime camouflaging lack of economic talent. And he gave warnings that such crime would not remain unpunished. "We are forced to overreport milk by the metric ton," someone told him on the telephone. "And you pretend to see nothing..."

"Stockraising is not my strong point," I was told by the prosecutor. "Where was I to look for these metric tons of overreported milk? I checked with the Central Statistical Administration -- they knew nothing about it. Nor did the people's control. True enough, the Gosbank dropped some vague hints about some kind of permission to sell kolkhoz milk. That was thread I picked up..."

It never occurred to the prosecutor that the overreporting was going on with the knowledge of rayon leaders. The republican Council of Ministers' permission to sell milk to kindergartens and to people "out in the sticks" who needed it was being applied in a peculiar fashion in Chimishliya. Since the rayon had messed up the procurements plan, what they did was this: They brought milk from nearby kolkhozes through the rural consumer society, and then drew up documents selling it to the very same farms "owing to lack of demand." The same thousands of liters were counted twice.

Raykom First Secretary G. Shimanskiy telephoned the prosecutor while the inspection was at its height. "You'd better deal with criminals," was his fatherly advice. "Leave the economic problems to us."

The prosecutor could not believe his ears. He nevertheless went to the farm and was even more amazed. People avoided him, refused to talk to him. "Quite right too, don't interfere with their work," was the raykom's comment.

Following Ye. Bryazu's report to the republican prosecutor, he was given assistance and the scam was soon exposed. But his good relations with the rayon leaders also came to an end. And when Bryazu instituted criminal proceedings against a gang of swindlers headed by the chief of the "Selkhoztekhnika" Rayon Office, matters came to a direct conflict. The most amazing point was that Shimanskiy himself was convinced that he was in the right. "Get it in your head," he preached to the prosecutor, "people are the rayon's main asset. It is, of course, disgusting that they have dabbled in embezzlement. But with whom are we to work if you want to suddenly clap eight specialists behind bars?"

The prosecutor heard such arguments on many occasions. When he arrested the chief veterinary surgeon for bribe-taking. When he refused to release from detention the rayon trade union committee chairman's son, who was involved in a robbery. "We all understand," people tried to convince the prosecutor, "that the letter of the law must be observed. But... not necessarily always."

Yevgeniy Grigoryevich would hardly forget a conversation with Shimanskiy shortly before the rayon party conference. "You are still young," the first secretary told him. "You're totally absorbed in your laws. And you don't understand the laws governing society's development, the economy..." Bryazu could not contain himself: "Lenin wrote that there cannot be one law for Kaluga and another for Kazan. In my view, you have yet another variety of law -- the law for Chimishliya."

However, people quite often believe that in addition to the truth of the law there is also another, much weightier "truth" -- the truth of life which supposedly gives economic managers the moral right to ride roughshod over the code's articles and paragraphs. From this viewpoint, a prosecutor's role appears somewhat theoretical. He is treated either as a pedant or, at best, as a quixotic idealist. And any "uninvited" interference in ecnomic affairs causes irritation.

This is what happened, for example, in Faleshty when Prosecutor N. Ursu instituted criminal proceedings against "Progress" Kolkhoz Chairman Petr Proka, who had fed 300 metric tons of bread to the livestock. Many people were, of course, indignant at the chairman's actions. But some people also excused him. It was said that he was guided by state interests. After all, he had not fed his own, personal animals...

So the prosecutor's principledness in Faleshty did not meet with, to put it mildly, approval from the rayon authorities. Moreover, attitudes toward him changed so much that on one occasion they tried to send Rayon Prosecutor N. Ursu as agent for... purchasing wine from peasants so that afterwards it could be credited to kolkhozes as supposedly harvested grapes. Incidentally, the prosecutor in a neighboring rayon was sent together with livestock purchasers "to frighten off the Ukrainian militiamen." It is amazing how a prosecutor's status is interpreted sometimes at local level.

However, V.I. Lenin wrote that it is the prosecutor who "is responsible for ensuring that not a single decision by a single local authority diverges from the law." It is the prosecutor who, according to Article 164 of the USSR Constitution, exercises "supreme supervision over the precise and uniform application of the laws." Maybe this was not known in Moldavia?

But no, it would be a distortion of the truth to ascribe the behavior of some rayon leaders to legal and even political illiteracy. I think that the causes lie elsewhere. In the fact that successful reporting was usually considered to be law. Appearances were more important than the essence. [paragraph continues]

It was under these conditions that the pernicious practice of defrauding the state put down roots in the republic's farms. Against this background, a prosecutor's independence was perceived solely as an infringement of the rayon authorities' prerogative. As soon as a prosecutor diagreed or protested an illegal decision, serious accusations were voiced: "He is not a rayon patriot." And even worse: "You want to be above the party and the soviets..." So it was not so much ignorance but ambition that prevented people from recognizing a prosecutor's independence as enshrined in the constitution. Custom and one-man rule overshadowed the simple truth: A prosecutor's official duty is to ensure that parochial "patriotism" does not prevail over the state's interests.

This is why Melnik, Bryazu, Ursu, and other prosecutors honestly performing their official duties found it so difficult to function. But, let us be blunt, by no means all of their colleagues resisted the pressure from patrons of overreporting and preachers of "the two truths." Some, like Komratskiy Rayon Prosecutor B. Nogay, were crushed by the local leadership. Others, like V. Podlesnik in Novoanenskiy Rayon, cheerfully went along with the window dressers. And yet others (representing the largest number) simply could not bring themselves to aggravate relations.

No, I have no intention of making generalizations, nor do I wish to contrast the principledness of law enforcement organ representatives with the unprincipledness of rayon leaders. Quite a few instances can be cited of prosecutors encountering both understanding and support from party and soviet organs in Moldavia. I know the names of these prosecutors -- I can name, for example, D. Postovan in Floreshtskiy Rayon and V. Tsurkan and V. Sturzu in Rybnitskiy Rayon. I know about local party organs in Bendery demanding principledness from the prosecutor and being unhappy about his lack of initiative. But all that is the norm. We are talking deviations from the norm. Had it not been for these deviations, the republic would probably not have lost its banner today. People would not be feeling guilty and ashamed as a result of the published instances of overreporting and window dressing.

People are tired of lies, of uncertainty, of the trials to which they have been subjected for a long time by their conscience. And they spoke about this honestly and bluntly at the recent Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum.

Despite all this, however, let us not ascribe the sins of the past just to circumstances. People behaved in different ways under identical circumstances. Both party and economic workers. And those who were duty-bound to monitor the observance of legality. Thus the question "Where was the prosecutor?" is fully justified. Because a prosecutor's inaction may be explained, but it cannot be justified.

MOLDAVIAN CONSUMER SERVICES MINISTER DISMISSED

LD081044 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 28 Nov 86 p 4

[Text] The Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Vladimir Maksimovich Yukin from the duties of Moldavian SSR minister for consumer services for infringements permitted to occur regarding housing legislation, which were manifested in facilitating the illegal exchange of apartments by leading workers when he was first secretary of Beltsy City Party Committee.

YELTSIN SPEAKS AT RESTRUCTURING PROGRESS SEMINAR

PM080925 [Editorial Report] Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 November 1986 carries on page 1 under the headline "Frank and Useful Conversation" a 1,200-word Sh. Muladzhanov report covering the second day of a seminar of Moscow CPSU raykom first secretaries on the theme "First Steps in Restructuring. Practice, Experience, Problems."

According to Muladzhanov, "The results of the discussion of questions touched upon during the seminar's work were summed up by B.N. Yeltsin, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom."

YELTIN ADDRESSES MOSCOW OFFICIALS ON HARVEST

PM080931 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 86 pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "Lessons of Joint Work"]

[Excerpt] A joint session of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom and Moscow CPSU Obkom Bureaus took place yesterday.

The session examined progress in fulfilling previously adopted decisions on the organization of harvesting work in 1986, the transportation, storage, and marketing of fruit and vegetables, and sponsorship assistance to Moscow Oblast farms. The results of this work were summed up and tasks for the coming period were outlined.

First secretaries of Moscow City party raykoms and Moscow Oblast gorkoms and raykoms; chairmen of Moscow City rayispolkoms and Moscow Oblast gorispolkoms and rayispolkoms; chiefs of a number of sections of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom and the Moscow CPSU Obkom; deputy chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom and the Moscow Oblispolkom; and leaders of a number of Moscow City and Oblast Soviet Main Administrations were invited to attend the session.

The session was addressed by B.N. Yeltsin, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA VIEWS CPSU RESOLUTION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

PM051629 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "In the CPSU Central Committee. On Further Reinforcing Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Strengthening the Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests"]

[Text] In a resolution adopted on this question the CPSU Central Committee notes that implementation of the course approved by the 27th CPSU Congress aimed at accelerating socioeconomic development, democratizing every aspect of social life, and enhancing the masses' creative activity is inseparable from the process of reinforcing socialist legality and law and order and ensuring reliable protection of Soviet citizens' constitutional rights and legitimate interests, as well as strict observance of the principles of social justice. In accordance with the congress directives, measures of a legislative, organizational, and educational nature are being consistently implemented with the objective of strengthening the legal foundations of state and public life and socialist discipline, eradicating overreporting and deception, overcoming drunkenness and alcoholism, and stepping up the struggle against unearned income, various violations of the law, and bureaucracy. [paragraph continues]

These measures have met with unanimous support among the people and are making a significant contribution to improving the whole atmosphere in society.

However, work aimed at ensuring socialist legality and law and order and protecting citizens' rights and legitimate interests is still not sufficiently effective and does not fully correspond to the demands of the time and the present stage in communist building. Serious deviations from legal norms, particularly in the process of resolving various issues affecting people's vital interests, are frequently permitted in the everyday practice of state and economic organs. Violations of work legislation, the established procedure for housing distribution, and the rules for imposing fines and other administrative exactions are fairly widespread. The struggle against infringements of state and public property and other mercenary crimes has weakened. This can be the only explanation of why groups of embezzlers and bribe takers, who have now been exposed, operated with impunity for a long time in a number of republics, oblasts, ministries, and departments. Phenomena such as these are radically at variance with the interests of Soviet society and are incompatible with the socialist way of life; an active and uncompromising struggle must be waged against them.

Regarding strict observance of the law and stronger guarantees of protection of citizens' rights and legitimate interests as an essential condition of the normal functioning of the Soviet political system, the development of our statehood, and the intensification of the people's socialist self-management, the CPSU Central Committee has instructed union republic communist party central committees and party kraykoms, obkoms, district committees [okruzhkoms], gorkoms, and raykoms to broadly develop and consistently and purposefully conduct work to ensure strict observance of socialist legality and citizens' rights, regarding this as one of the most important, inalienable aspects of the restructuring process.

Together with local soviets, party committees bear full responsibility for the state of legality and law and order in their territory. They are expected to constantly bear these matters in mind, direct and coordinate the efforts of party organizations, state institutions, law enforcement organs, and the entire public in the eradication and prevention of any deviations from the requirements of the law and any actions encroaching on citizens's rights, and to make active use of organizational, economic, ideological, and legal means for this purpose.

The CPSU Central Committee has stressed the need to devote unremitting attention to working people's legal education and to cultivate in them a thorough understanding of the unity of rights and duties, a high degree of civic-mindedness, respect for Soviet law and the rules of socialist society, and an uncompromising attitude to any violations of socialist legality; to be constantly concerned with improving the legal training of leading cadres and specialists, regarding this as an essential condition of improving their practical qualifications; and to cultivate in all Soviet people the belief that firm legality and conscious discipline are an inalienable part of our democracy, whose further development actively contributes to the development of every aspect of Soviet society's economic and social life.

The resolution notes that every violation of legality, no matter by whom, must be given a sharp, principled appraisal and be strongly condemned, and the persons guilty must be severely punished. In this respect it is essential to consistently fulfill the requirement of the CPSU Statute regarding Communists' dual responsibility for any violation of the law -- their responsibility to the state and to the party. And with regard to those who try to flout Soviet law and citizens' rights, there cannot and must not be any question of liberalism or leniency.

The CPSU Central Committee believes it necessary to considerably increase the responsibility of local soviets and their executive and administrative organs at all levels with regard to ensuring strict observance of the law by state institutions, economic organizations, officials, and all citizens and guaranteeing the protection of public order in their own territory. Any manifestations of bureaucracy and red tape and a callous, formal attitude to people and to satisfying their legitimate interests and requirements must be decisively overcome.

Local soviets are expected to actively influence the activity of internal affairs organs and organs of justice within their jurisdiction and to ensure systematic examination of reports and communications by the leaders of these organs at sessions and meetings of standing commissions and ispolkoms, in labour collectives, and in places of residence. Unremitting attention must be paid to increasing the precision and standard of work done by notarial offices, colleges of lawyers, legal advice bureaus, local state automobile inspection subdivisions, regional inspectors, and militia patrol and passport services.

We must persistently strive to enhance the role of organs of people's control, comrades courts, the voluntary people's militia, temperance societies, and other social organizations in the task of reinforcing legality and increasing the activeness of every Soviet citizen in the fulfillment of his constitutional duties to protect socialist property and public order.

Restructuring the work of the courts, the public prosecutor's office, the militia, and other law enforcement organs is recognized as being necessary in order to ensure that they reliably guarantee the protection of state interests and citizens' rights, wage an even more effective struggle against crime and violations of the law, are in close touch with the working people, and set a real example of the strictest possible observance of legality.

The CPSU Central committee has instructed Comrade V.I. Terebilov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court; Comrade A.M. Rekunkov, USSR prosecutor general; Comrade A.V. Vlasov, USSR minister of internal affairs; Comrade B.V. Kravtsov, USSR minister of justice; and Comrade Ye.V. Anisimov, chief arbiter of the USSR State Board of Arbitration; to persistently eliminate shortcomings in the activity of the corresponding law enforcement organs, improve their leadership of them, and increase to the utmost their exactingness toward cadres for irreproachable fulfillment of their official duty and constant improvement in their professional training. The party committees and party bureaus of law enforcement ministries and departments are instructed to increase the responsibility of Communists working in the apparatuses, including leading cadres, for their personal contribution to the restructuring process and to eliminating shortcomings in the areas with which they are entrusted.

The party Central Committee has demanded a decisive end to manifestations of prejudice or a tendentious approach when conducting inquiries, preliminary investigations, and court examinations, as well as signs of red tape, callousness, and indifference to people's fate. Cases of unsubstantiated detentions and arrests and of citizens being unlawfully charged must be completely eradicated from the work practice of law enforcement organs. Every such case must be examined as a matter or urgency and be carefully checked out, with strict, principled conclusions then being drawn.

The attention of party committees has been drawn to the need to increase political leadership of law enforcement organs, monitor their activities, and enhance their responsibility to accurately fulfill the functions incumbent on them. [paragraph continues]

In this respect the CPSU Central Committee has pointed out that no interference will be tolerated from any quarter in the investigation and court examination of specific cases.

Constant concern must be shown to enhance the qualitiative makeup and education of cadres in law enforcement organs and strictly ensure that politically mature, morally irreproachable people who have both a high level of professional training and civic courage, integrity, and a keen sense of justice are selected for work in the courts, the public prosecutor's office, and the organs of internal affairs and justice. In order to do this it is necessary to broaden the practice of accepting people assigned by labor collectives ands party and Komsomol organizations to work in these organs and tirelessly educate members of law enforcement organs in the spirit of deep respect for the law, real humanity, and selfless, disinterested service to the people.

The CPSU Central Committee considers it necessary to enhance the militancy of primary party organizations operating in the courts, institutions under the public prosecutor's office, the Ministry of Justice, and the State Board of Arbitration, and subdivisions of the internal affairs organs and to constantly orient them toward actively influencing improvements in the work of the apparatus concerning the observance of Soviet law and the fulfillment of party and government directives and devoting particular attention to reinforing official discipline among personnel.

Ministries and departments are instructed to steadily increase the responsibility of leaders of enterprises, institutions, and organizations for the observance of state and contractual discipline, labor legislation, and the laws on protecting socialist property and struggling against overreporting, the manufacture of poor-quality products, bad management, and wastefulness. We must persistently strive to ensure that legal levers, departmental control, cadre and legal services, and the whole practice of law enforcement effectively help to develop socialist enterprise and eliminate narrow departmental, bureaucratic impediments retarging scientific and technical progress and also that they serve as a firm barrier in the way of everything that runs counter to the principles of socialist economic management. We must introduce proper order to the confirmation of instructions and the issuing of orders of a standard nature, ensure that departmental acts correspond to legislation in force, and revise obsolete provisions in good time.

It is recommended that the AUCCTU, trade union sector committees, republic, kray, oblast, and city trade union councils, and primary trade union organizations step up their activity to protect working people's legitimate interests and supervise and monitor the observance of labor legislation, carry out careful checks regarding the validity of decisions taken when labor contracts are cancelled at the initiative of the administration, show firmness and consistency in cases where established procedure is broken, and prevent the unlawful dismissal of working people. It is necessary to enhance the role of technical and legal trade union inspections in the task of improving working conditions and ensuring the observance of the norms of labor legislation. Activists from among the working people themselves must become more broadly involved in trade union work.

The USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, scientific research institutes, and academic institutions attached to law enforcement organs are called upon to improve the standard of scientific research, more actively analyze topical issues relating to the reinforcement of legality, strengthen the link between juridical science and practice, and improve the training of legal cadres and the legal education system in schools, vocational and technical schools, specialized secondary shools, and VUZes.

It is recommended that the editorial boards of central and local newspapers and journals, television, and radio provide regular coverage of the experience of work done by party, soviet, economic and law enforcement organs and social organizations to strengthen socialist legality and law and order and to use legal methods in the restructuring of economic activity. The mass information media, the resolution notes, are called upon to cultivate deep respect for the law in people through the items they publish and, by taking specific examples from life, convincingly show that strict observance of legislative requirements is in the interests of society as a whle and of every Soviet individual and is a decisive factor in ensuring firm law and order and the unshakeability of citizens' rights.

ENTOMBMENT OF CHERNOBYL REACTOR COMPLETED

LD051350 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 5 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS -- The construction of a reinforced-concrete structure entombing stricken Unit Four of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant has been completed.

Academician Valeriy Legasov, a member of the government commission for eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl power plant accident in April this year, said to a TASS correspondent today that the source of radioactive danger had been sealed off forever.

Academician Legasov observed that the "sarcophagus" was a complex engineering structure. It was fitted out with monitoring and diagnostic gauges, a reliable system of heat-exchange and ventilation complete with powerful purification installations.

A special service had been set up at the power facility, Legasov said. "It operates instruments inside the entombment structure and monitors all their parameters. A number of Soviet research institutes maintain there their permanent representatives to study physical and chemical processes."

"All these measurements are fed into a data-processing centre which transmits them to the government commission, the recently established Ministry for Atomic Power Engineering, the State Committee for Safety in Atomic Power Engineering, academic institutes and other interested organizatons."

The academician said that "the water of the River Pripyat and the Kiev water reservoir where it flows is clean thanks to the construction of a so-called wall in the ground water and other measures.

Most of the station has been decontaminated. The rate of decontimination work will be stepped up now that the sarcophagus has been built along the entire 30-kilometre zone around the reactor.

The station itself is entering the period of normal operation. Unit 1 is working at full capacity, unit 2 at 50-percent rated capacity which corresponds to the programme for putting it inot maximum operational regime."

MOTIVES FOR ECONOMIC 'RESTRUCTURING' ASSESSED

AU280613 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 14 Nov 86 p 6

[Article by APN commentator Leonid Korenev: "Enhancing the Legal Powers and Responsibility of Enterprises"]

[Text] Having to rebuild even an ordinary family house is a rather difficult task and hardly anyone will take it up without compelling reasons, just out of love for modern interior design. But to rebuild the entire multi-storied edifice of the economy of the Soviet Union, an economy that oprates with hundreds of billions of rubles and manufactures 20 percent of worldwide industrial production, one needs much more than the sincere and praiseworthy wish for an improvement. The need must be very pressing, indeed. The risks involved are much too big -- the introduction of unverified methods of management can result in losses and social expenditures of many billions. It is therefore to no one's surprise that economic experiements have always had many open enemies, and even more hidden ones. The harsh and prosaic reality of life often even reinforced their skepticism. After all, even an outdated and creaky carriage is better than an automobile taken into pieces.

In its Eighth 5-Year Plan (1966-70) the USSR used national income increased 41 percent; in the Ninth 5-Year Plan (1971-75), 28 percent; in the Tenth 5-Year Plan (1976-80), 21 percent; and in the preceding, 11th 5-Year Plan (1981-85), 16.5 percent.

It is thus evident that the rate of economic growth is slowing down. This can be explained, to a certain degree, by the steadily increasing level of the point of departure. However, even the absolute figures on the growth of national income began to decline in the last few years. Other negative trends, too, were becoming more and more clearly evident. The growth rate of cash earnings, for example, began to exceed the growth rate of labor productivity. The result was an imbalance between supply and demand, a long and continuously changing list of products in short supply, and a steadily growing share of "deposited demand" in the form of unrealized savings of the population. Ultimately, and this was the most momentous consequence, the implementation of social programs was becoming increasingly difficult, including programs of such importance as the housing program.

The question of replacing directive methods of national economic management by economic methods was brought to the agenda of the day. The discipline of compulsion had to give way to the discipline of the ruble.

This does not mean that directive methods have come to be seen as bad in principle. Directive methods as such are not that bad, provided, of course, that they are not identified with distortions such as voluntarism and bureaucratism. But extremes can be easily found in just any system.

In a certain stage of the USSR's development, it was logical to use directive methods -- that is, methods relying on the force of direct disposition, direct order. The system was, on the whole, harmoneous and free of inner contradictions and as such it was also effective. In, literally, a decade of stormy industrialization it brought the country in many indicators to the level of the industrially most advanced countries of the world, which had needed a far longer period to achieve such results.

But the system did have one major contradiction -- an external one. It consisted in the fact that the state was effecting its final economic targets predominantly by foreign economic means, while it was making active use of administrative methods. [sentence as published] [paragraph continues]

Proportionately to the successes of economic construction, this system had to become antiquated sooner or later and be replaced by a different system. After all, the system was impeding initiative For some time it was possible to ignore this curtailment of initiative, but the moment came when it was no longer possible to do without it. Given the present magnitude of the USSR national economy, it is no longer possible to predict "from the center" the activity of several tens of thousands of enterprises. Experts have calculated that in terms of its velocity and complexity, the process of choosing optimal regimes in the Soviet economy exceeds the parameters placed on the calculation of the orbit of a spaceship flying beyond the boundaries of the solar system. The solution of the problem had to resemble the solution that is applied in space research -- enhancing the degree of autonomy and transferring functions to the on-board computer.

Indeed, the advanced economy of today is far too complex and too interwoven and its detailed steering from a single center has become increasingly difficult, even physically. On the other hand, the preparedness of cadres has reached a standard where the work collectives are capable of taking over part of the managerial responsibilities.

The directive forms of management, which are coupled with a very strong centralization, thus ceased playing their role. The old "locomotive" did its share of honest work on a very long route and had to retire and make way for a more recent model.

A thorough modernization of the system of management was the aim of the 1965 reform. It reduced the number of directive indicators to five: volume; basic nomenklatura; payroll fund; profit and profitability; and relations toward the state budget. Although the reform did yield an effect, it turned out to be smaller than expected and, above all, it gradually began to grow weaker.

A new step toward perfecting the economic mechanism was taken in 1979. There occurred another change in the indicators and the idea was to form the annual plan as the outcome of direct relations among enterprises. Again, the results were not very significant. Moreover, something that was inexplicable at first sight occurred in both cases -- administrative methods, "thrown out of the door," were creeping back "through the window."

Why were the enterprises unable to gain the sought-after independence and the possibility to show initiative and flexibility, despite the high qualifications of their cadres?

Today we already know the answer to this question. The mistake was that we underestimated the force of the inertia of the old model. In the economy it is not enough to say "open, sesame!" for the door to really open.

To cut across the "vicious circle," in 1984, 5 union and republic ministries and in 1985 an additional 20 embarked upon the path of wide-ranging economic experiments. The experiment encompassed 2,300 enterprises producing 12 percent of the country's industrial output. As of 1986 one-third of all enterprises work under the new conditions. Altogether, they produce more than 50 percent of total industrial output. This is no longer an experiment but mass practice. As of 1987 it will be joined by all industrial enterprises. In the 1986-90 period, the new methods of management will be introduced into all branches of the economy.

Wherein lies the main difference between current economic experiments and the preceding attempts at improving the economic mechanism? Not in every case is there any significant "shift" in innovation. The difference does not lie in the yield either -- an analysis has revealed that the yield is often modest compared with the expectations of optimists and the expended efforts. The most important feature of the experiments is something else. [paragraph continues]

They have tested all kinds of variants, which were not determined with final validity, and have therefore played the role of a "reconnaissance scout" in exposing and reinforcing the contradictions between the outdated economic mechanism and the technological revolution. It was precisely the experiments that made it possible to find the answer that we know today. This answer is that during previous attempts at reforming the Soviet economy we sought some sort of a compromise between two disparate systems -- an essentially administrative one and an essentially economic one. There can be no doubt that transitory variants are possible. However, such variants could not bring about any fundamental improvement of the situation and led to a number of new complications. The result was a clear or hidden "severance" just like during transplant operations.

Having thus found ourselves at the crossroads of contradictions, we drew up the concept of a radical reform that does not stop in the middle of the road, a concept of the inevitability to remove, while restructuring the economy, old psychological stereotypes and to overcome inertia in thinking. This is the only way that ensures the acceleration of the rate of socioeconomic development and not just the renewal of the preceding rate.

As has already been said, the wide-ranging economic experiments have been playing the role of "reconnaissance scouts" thus far. And as Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his speech before the party aktiv in Khabarovsk, there are no ready-made recipes for ensuring the task of accelerating the economic development -- either in the state planning office, or in the government or the Politburo. We must learn "on the job," as we tackle the new tasks.

Proceeding from these targets, which variants of restructuring the economic mechanism appear to be the most promising ones? A short time ago scientists of the Sociological Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences carried out an analysis of the initial results of the experiment in industry. Their conclusion, as well as the conclusion reached by economists, was that the most rational variant is the "Sumy" model, that is, the variant operating in the M.V. Frunze Machine Building Association in Sumy.

Self-Financing: The Sumy Model [subhead]

A great deal is now being written about this enterprise in the Soviet press, not only in specialized economic publications, which is quite natural, but also in newspapers for the general public. It could be precisely this great glory (which, by the way, is well deserved) that might explain the eagerness of many zealous enthusiasts to make immediate and expeditious use of the "Sumy model," that is, of the experiences obtained in the course of the economic experiment in the Sumy, M.V. Frunze Machine Building Association.

The results are also clear. From the national viewpoint, the volume of the association's profits increased 32 percent in 1985 and labor productivity 13 percent. And from the individual viewpoint, average wages of workers increased 6 percent, to R223 a month. This is a good growth rate, especially if we consider that the experiment is only starting.

As of next year dozens of enterprises in other branches will also make the transition to self-financing, which is the principle of the association's activity. Why not more, and why not right now? After all, it has already been determined that the "Sumy model" would be applied in the entire industry in the future. And even now the model is not a "lonely sail in the sea." It is being applied in the largest car factory in the USSR, in the Togliatti Avto VAZ association, and here, too, it has confirmed its great efficiency.

The outcome of undue haste in expanding the principles of self-financing would not be good. It is not only a question of caution. The reason is simple. The "Sumy model" is nothing for the weak. It is for the strong and the enterprising, and there are not many of those. It is not only something for volunteers from among the managerial staff of enterprises, but also for work collectives in their entirety and it needs therefore understanding and democratic assessment at all levels. It is necessary to assess not only possible profits but also to consider the possibility of a loss. By providing genuine independence, the state abolishes its interference in the economic activity of the enterprise and at the same time and to the same degree sets itself free from responsibility for its results. Because the "protective shield" of centralized subsidies is removed and the bank can withold a credit, independence can have its seamy side as well. Wherever you have winners, there you also have losers. But does efficiency necessarily have to be a cruel thing? After all, the workers of an enterprise are the least to blame for the obsolescence of its products and their not being able to hold their own in competition. Why should their wages suffer?

That is why in the Avto VAZ in Togliatti, for example, the transition to the principles of self-financing was preceded not only by a drive to explain economic terms and "liquidate economic illiteracy" but also by a scrupulous balancing of earned and unearned money, including the four cubic meters of bank notes paid out in that huge enterprise every pay day. That is also why it was necessary even the Sumy association, a "relative" of the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, to wait with the introduction of the experiences of a pace-setting enterprise despite long preparations and the fact that one of Sumy's employees -- Hero of Socialist Labor V. Lukyanenko, the association's former director general -- assumed the post of minister and should thus have, as one is inclined to think, all the trump-cards in his hands. However, almost one in ten enterprises of that branch either makes losses or is unprofitable and not all of them can join the profit-making enterprises at once. Does that mean a new redistribution at the expense of outstanding enterprises? But that is exactly what we must do away with so laboriously. It amounts, in reality, to "penalizing those who excel" and to charity for those who trail behind.

Loss-making production is still widespread in the country's national economy. As N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, said in the report on the 12th 5-Year Plan at the last session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 13 percent of enterprises in the industrial sector alone accrued losses in 1985, with these losses exceeding the sum of R6 billion on aggregate.

There is yet another reason, one which may not be evident at first sight, that makes it impossible to make an immediate transition to self-financing. The system of price-setting in the country, created in long years, promotes in many respects an uneconomical use of resources and it, too, requires marked improvement. It may not be necessary to explain how difficult it is to introduce changes into this mechanism, in which every component is intertwined with the others and, in the final analysis, also with the prices of consumer goods. And, finally, it is necessary to calculate a socially reasonable norm of profit for those enterprises that operate at a profit today to prevent the emergence of artificial and socially unwarranted prerogatives. In the Avto VAZ association, the share of retained profits for the company's own needs is roughly the same as the chare of profits remitted to the state budget. But the ratio in the Sumy association is a different one -- it remits slightly over 25 percent of profits to the state budget and retains more than two-thirds of profits for its own needs. And it is natural that in every new case these proportions will have to be determined individually.

"Have you ever seen weeping ministers?," the USSR minister of finance asked a Moscow PRAVDA correspondent at the beginning of an interview about the problems of self-financing. And he went on to explain that some ministers were demanding additional credits, without any credible guarantees that they will be in the position to repay them, and argued that they need to pay workers' wages. For the time being, the losses of ministries and enterprises that trail behind are being unjustifiedly covered at the expense of prospering enterprises. With the advancement of the economic reform, this should become increasingly a memory of bygone practices. Otherwise it will be impossible to resolve the task of accelerating social development. Tariff wage rates in the manufacturing branches of the Soviet national economy should increase by an average of 25 to 30 percent in the current 5-year plan. But for the first time ever, this increase will not be effected in a centralized fashion: The enterprises working according to the new methods will themselves have to earn the resources for the increase.

The collective of the Sumy Association already proceeds in this way. For every ruble of profit made in 1985, it remitted 27 kopecks to the budget and 2 kopecks to the ministry and retained 71 kopecks for its own needs. Of this, it earmarked 45 kopecks for expanding production and its technological modernization; 15 kopecks for material incentices; and the remainder for the social development of the labor force. More than R40 million in profits remained at the association's own disposal and R16 million were remitted to the budget. In this way the employees of the Sumy association not only ensured their own earnings, housing construction, resources for the improvement of their medical facilities, and so forth, but they also avoided being debtors of the state as is the case of enterprises that operate at a loss. But the state was benefitted in yet another way. Compared with 1984, the remittances to the budget increased by roughly one-third, even though at that time the state simply collected the entire profit made in excess of the plan and now it gets only a fixed proportion -- 27 percent, and not single kopeck more. Moreover, the association itself sees to its own technical development (the resources for this used to be appropriated in a centralized fashion), allocates formidable resources for this development, and does not "digest" the entire profit itself. Therein is also a strict calculation -- calculation with the future.

The restructuring of the Soviet economy on the basis of new principles of management, principles that are conducive to the tasks of accelerating the economy's development, is, in fact, only at the very beginning. And these intial steps are not easy. No one promises an easy life in the near future. But the Soviet economy has set out on this path of transformations with firm strides.